arXiv:1601.05992v2 [math.AP] 27 Aug 2016

EXPLICIT EXPONENTIAL CONVERGENCE TO EQUILIBRIUM FOR NONLINEAR REACTION-DIFFUSION SYSTEMS WITH DETAILED BALANCE CONDITION

KLEMENS FELLNER, BAO QUOC TANG

Abstract. The convergence to equilibrium of mass action reaction-diffusion systems arising from networks of chemical reactions is studied. The considered reaction networks are assumed to satisfy the detailed balance condition and have no boundary equilibria. We propose a general approach based on the so-called entropy method, which is able to quantify with explicitly computable rates the decay of an entropy functional in terms of an entropy entropy-dissipation inequality based on the totality of the conservation laws of the system.

As a consequence follows convergence to the unique detailed balance equilibrium with explicitly computable convergence rates. The general approach is further detailed for two important example systems: a single reversible reaction involving an arbitrary number of chemical substances and a chain of two reversible reactions arising from enzyme reactions.

Contents

1. Introduction and main results 1
2. The general method 9
2.1. Preliminary estimates and inequalities 10
2.2. A constructive method to prove the EED estimate 12
3. A single reversible reaction - Proof of Theorem 1.2 18
4. Reversible enzyme reactions - Proof of Theorem 1.3 22
5. Summary, further applications and open problems 26
5.1. Further applications 26
5.2. Open problems 27
References 27

1. Introduction and main results

In this paper, we study exponential convergence to equilibrium with explicitly bounded rates and constants for reaction-diffusion systems arising from chemical reaction networks.

The considered reaction-diffusion systems describe networks of chemical reactions according to the *law of mass action kinetics* and under the assumption of the *detailed balance condition*. More precisely, we consider I chemical substances $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_I$ reacting in R reversible reactions of the form

$$\alpha_1^r \mathcal{C}_1 + \ldots + \alpha_I^r \mathcal{C}_I \underset{k_f^r}{\overset{k_b^r}{\rightleftharpoons}} \beta_1^r \mathcal{C}_1 + \ldots + \beta_I^r \mathcal{C}_I$$

for $r = 1, 2, \dots, R$ with the nonnegative stoichiometric coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r = (\alpha_1^r, \dots, \alpha_I^r) \in (\{0\} \cup [1, \infty))^I$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^r = (\beta_1^r, \dots, \beta_I^r) \in (\{0\} \cup [1, \infty))^I$ and the positive forward and backward reaction rate constants $k_f^r > 0$ and $k_b^r > 0$. The corresponding reaction-diffusion system for the concentration vector $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_I) : \Omega \times [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)^I$ subject to homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions reads as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\boldsymbol{c} = \mathbb{D}\Delta \boldsymbol{c} - \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}), && \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ &\nabla \boldsymbol{c} \cdot \nu = 0, && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ &\boldsymbol{c}(x, 0) = \boldsymbol{c}_0(x), && \text{on } \Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B35, 35B40, 35K57, 35Q92.

Key words and phrases. Reaction-Diffusion Systems; Exponential Convergence to Equilibrium; Entropy Method; Chemical Reaction Networks; Detailed Balance Condition.

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ (e.g. $\partial\Omega \in C^{2+\epsilon}, \epsilon > 0$), outward normal unit vector ν and normalised volume, i.e.

$$|\Omega| = 1$$

(this is w.l.o.g. by rescaling the position variable $x \in \Omega$ as $x \to x|\Omega|^{1/n}$). Moreover, $\mathbb{D} = \mathrm{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_I)$ is a uniformly positive definite diffusion matrix, i.e. $0 < d_{min} \le d_i \le d_{max} < +\infty$ for all $i = 1, \dots, I$, and the reaction vector $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c})$ represents the chemical reactions according to the mass action law, i.e.

$$\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{r=1}^{R} (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r - \boldsymbol{\beta}^r) \left(k_f^r \, \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - k_b^r \, \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right) \quad \text{with} \quad \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} = \prod_{i=1}^{I} c_i^{\alpha_i^r} \quad \text{for} \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, R. \tag{1.2}$$

Here, by following e.g. [VVV94], we observe that the reaction vector $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c})$ can be written as product of the stoichiometric matrix

$$W = ((\boldsymbol{\beta}^r - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^r)_{r=1,\dots,R})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times I},$$

which is also called Wegscheider matrix, and the reaction rates vector $\mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{c})$ as modelled according to the mass action law, i.e.

$$\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}) = -W^\top \mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{c}), \qquad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{c}) = (K^r(\boldsymbol{c}))_{r=1,\dots,R} := \left(k_f^r \, \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - k_b^r \, \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right)_{r=1,\dots,R}.$$

The range $\mathrm{rg}(W^\top)$ is called the *stoichiometric subspace* and the above implies that $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathrm{rg}(W^\top)$. As a consequence, a key structural property of the reaction vector $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c})$ is the codim of W, which we denote by $m = \dim \ker(W)$.

If $m > 0$, then there exists a (non-unique) matrix $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times I}$ of zero left-eigenvectors such that $\mathbb{Q}\,\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}) = 0$ for all states $\boldsymbol{c}$. As a consequence, we have the following mass conservation laws for (1.1)–(1.2)

$$\int_\Omega \mathbb{Q}\, \boldsymbol{c}(t) dx = \int_\Omega \mathbb{Q}\, \boldsymbol{c}_0 \, dx \qquad \text{or equivalently} \qquad \mathbb{Q}\, \overline{\boldsymbol{c}}(t) = \mathbf{M} := \mathbb{Q}\, \overline{\boldsymbol{c}_0} \quad \text{for all} \quad t > 0, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = (\overline{c_1}, \dots, \overline{c_I})$ with $\overline{c_i}(t) = \int_\Omega c_i(x,t) dx$ is the spatially averaged concentration vector (recall $|\Omega| = 1$) and $\mathbf{M}$ denotes the vector of initial masses, which can be assumed non-negative, i.e. $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\ge 0}$ (after changing the sign of the rows of $\mathbb{Q}$, for which the corresponding component of $\mathbf{M}$ should be negative). If $m = 0$, then the system (1.1)–(1.2) has no conservation law.

Moreover, it is well known that the reaction vector $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c})$ according to the mass action law, satisfies the quasi-positivity condition: If $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}) = (R_1(\boldsymbol{c}), \dots, R_I(\boldsymbol{c}))^\top$, then

$$\forall i = 1, 2, \dots I: \quad R_i(c_1, \dots, c_{i-1}, 0, c_{i+1}, \dots, c_I) \ge 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad c_1, \dots, c_{i-1}, c_{i+1}, \dots, c_I \ge 0.$$

As a consequence, solutions to (1.1)-(1.2) subject to non-negative initial data $\boldsymbol{c}_0 \ge 0$ remain non-negative $\boldsymbol{c}(t) \ge 0$ for all times $t > 0$, see e.g. [Pie10].

The first main assumption concerning that reactions networks considered in this work is the *detailed balance condition*, see e.g. [HJ72, Vol72, Fei79, VVV94]: A state $\boldsymbol{c}^* \in [0, +\infty)^I$ is called a homogeneous equilibrium or shortly an equilibrium of (1.1)–(1.2) if and only if

$$\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}^*) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{Q}\, \boldsymbol{c}^* = \mathbf{M}.$$

(**A1**) System (1.1)–(1.2) is assumed to satisfy the *detailed balance condition*, that is there exists an equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty \in (0, +\infty)^I$ such that any forward reaction is balanced with its corresponding backward reaction at this equilibrium, i.e.

$$k_f^r \, \boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} = k_b^r \, \boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}, \qquad \text{for all} \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, R.$$

This equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ is called a *detailed balance equilibrium*.

The detailed balance condition allows to rescale the system (1.1)–(1.2) such that we may assume w.l.o.g.

$$k_f^r = k_b^r = k^r > 0, \qquad \text{for all} \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, R. \tag{1.4}$$

This rescaling simplifies the formulation of a second crucial consequence of the detailed balance condition that the logarithmic entropy (or free energy) functional, which is the key quantity of our study,

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \int_\Omega (c_i \log c_i - c_i + 1) \, dx, \tag{1.5}$$

decays monotone in time according to the following entropy-dissipation functional

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) = -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \int_\Omega d_i \frac{|\nabla c_i|^2}{c_i} dx + \sum_{r=1}^{R} k^r \int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r})(\log \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \log \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}) \, dx \ge 0. \tag{1.6}$$

It is well known for detailed balanced reaction networks (see e.g. [HJ72] for the ODE systems and [GGH96, Lemma 3.4] for reaction-diffusion systems with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions) that for a given positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$, there exists a unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = (c_{1,\infty}, \dots, c_{I,\infty})$ of (1.1), which is the unique vector of positive constants $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty > 0$ balancing all the reactions and satisfying the mass conservation laws, i.e.

$$\boldsymbol{c}_\infty > 0 \ : \quad \boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} = \boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \quad \text{for all} \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, R \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{Q}\,\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = \mathbf{M}. \tag{1.7}$$

Note that the existence of a positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty > 0$ can typically also be expected for non-negative initial mass vectors $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}$ with exceptions when $\mathbf{M} = 0$. However, the (chemically meaningless) reversible reaction $\mathcal{C}_1 \leftrightarrow 2\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2$ constitutes an example with positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = \mathbf{1}$ in the case when the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M} = 0$ since $\mathbb{Q} = (1, -1)$ for this system.

It is important to remark that besides the unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty > 0$, there may also exist additional, so-called boundary equilibria, for which $c^*_{i,\infty} = 0$ for at least one index $i = 1, \dots, I$. See Remark 2.1 for an example of a system having a boundary equilibrium.

In this paper, we only consider systems with positive detailed balance equilibrium (1.7) and without boundary equilibria. We therefore impose the following second equilibrium assumption:

(**A2**) The system (1.1)–(1.2) features *no boundary equilibrium*, that is (1.1)–(1.2) does not possess an equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}^* \in \partial[0, +\infty)^I$.

Assumption (**A2**) is a natural structural condition in order to prove an entropy entropy-dissipation estimate like presented in the following and stated in (1.9). In fact, for general systems featuring boundary equilibria, the behaviour near a boundary equilibrium is unclear and boundary equilibria are able to prevent global exponential decay to an asymptotically stable positive detailed balance equilibrium, see e.g. [DFT]. It is also remarked that there exists a large class of systems possessing no boundary equilibria. See e.g. [CF06] for necessary conditions to determine such systems.

The large time behaviour of solutions to nonlinear reaction-diffusion systems is a highly active research area, which poses many open problems. Classical methods include e.g. linearisation techniques, spectral analysis, invariant regions and Lyapunov stability arguments.

More recently, the so-called entropy method proved to be a very useful and powerful improvement of classical Lyapunov methods, as it allows, for instance, to show explicit exponential convergence to equilibrium for reaction-diffusion systems. The basic idea of the entropy method consists in studying the large-time asymptotics of a dissipative PDE model by looking for a nonnegative convex entropy functional $\mathcal{E}(f)$ and its nonnegative entropy-dissipation functional

$$\mathcal{D}(f) = -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(f(t)) \geq 0$$

along the flow of a PDE model, which is well-behaved in the following sense: firstly, all states satisfying $\mathcal{D}(f) = 0$ as well as all the involved conservation laws identify a unique entropy-minimising equilibrium f_∞, i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}(f) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{all conservation laws} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad f = f_\infty,$$

and secondly, there exists an *entropy entropy-dissipation (EED for short) estimate* of the form

$$\mathcal{D}(f) \geq \Phi(\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)), \qquad \text{with} \quad \Phi(x) \geq 0, \qquad \Phi(x) = 0 \iff x = 0,$$

for some nonnegative function Φ. We remark, that such an inequality can only hold when all the conserved quantities are taken into account. Moreover, if $\Phi'(0) \neq 0$, a Gronwall argument usually implies exponential convergence toward f_∞ in relative entropy $\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)$ with a rate, which can be explicitly estimated. Finally, by applying Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker type inequalities to the relative entropy $\mathcal{E}(f) - \mathcal{E}(f_\infty)$ (recall that $\mathcal{E}(f)$ is convex), one obtains exponential convergence to equilibrium, for instance, w.r.t. the L^1-norm.

The entropy method is a fully nonlinear alternative to arguments based on linearisation around the equilibrium and has the advantage of being quite robust with respect to variations and generalisations of the model system. This is due to the fact that the entropy method relies mainly on functional inequalities which have no direct link to the original PDE model. Generalised models typically feature related entropy and entropy-dissipation functionals. Thus, previously established EED estimates may very usefully be re-applied.

The entropy method has previously been used for scalar equations: nonlinear diffusion equations (such as fast diffusions [CV03, PD02], Landau equation [DV00]), integral equations (such as the spatially

homogeneous Boltzmann equation [TV99, TV00, Vil03]), kinetic equations (see e.g. [DV01, DV05, FNS04]), or coagulation-fragmentation models (see e.g. [CDF08, CDF08a]). For certain systems of drift-diffusion-reaction equations in semiconductor physics, an entropy entropy-dissipation estimate has been shown in two dimensions indirectly via a compactness-based contradiction argument in [GGH96, GH97].

The first results for EED estimates for reaction-diffusion systems with explicit rates and constants were established in [DF06, DF08, DFM08, GZ10, DF14] in particular cases of reversible equations with (at most) quadratic nonlinearities.

In this paper, we aim to generalise the entropy method to reaction-diffusion systems with arbitrary mass action law nonlinearities and, as a consequence, show exponential convergence to equilibrium for (1.1) with explicit bounds on the rates and constants. The obtained results extend recent works on the convergence to equilibrium for nonlinear chemical reaction-diffusion systems, see e.g. [MHM15, FL16, FLT].

Before stating our results, we remark that for general nonlinear reaction-diffusion systems of the form (1.1)–(1.2), the existence of global classical or weak solutions is often an open problem, especially in higher space dimensions and for super-quadratic nonlinearities (see e.g. the survey [Pie10] and Remark 1.1 for a more detailed discussion). This is due to the lack of sufficiently strong a-priori estimates in order to control nonlinear terms (comparison principles do not hold except for special systems).

Recently, Fischer [Fis15] proved the global existence of so-called "renormalised solution" for general reaction-diffusion systems, which dissipate the entropy (1.5), and thus provided the existence of global renormalised solutions of system (1.1)–(1.2) for arbitrary stoichiometric coefficients.

Proposition 1.1 (Global renormalised solutions to mass action reaction-diffusion systems [Fis15])**.** *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. Assume that the diffusion matrix $\mathbb{D}$ is positive definite, i.e. $d_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, I$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}_0 \in L^1(\Omega)^I$ be nonnegative initial data with $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) < +\infty$.*

Then, there exists a global in time non-negative renormalised solution $\boldsymbol{c}$ to (1.1)–(1.2), i.e. $0 \le c_i \in L^\infty_{loc}([0,+\infty); L^1(\Omega))$ and $\sqrt{c_i} \in L^2_{loc}([0,+\infty); H^1(\Omega))$, and for every smooth function $\xi : (\mathbb{R}_+)^I \to \mathbb{R}$ with compactly supported derivative $\nabla\xi$ and for every testfunction $\psi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega} \times [0,+\infty))$ the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \xi(\boldsymbol{c}(\cdot,T))\psi(\cdot,T)\,dx - \int_\Omega \xi(\boldsymbol{c}_0)\psi(\cdot,0)\,dx - \int_0^T\int_\Omega \xi(\boldsymbol{c})\frac{d}{dt}\psi\,dxdt \\ = -\sum_{i,j=1}^I \int_0^T\int_\Omega \psi\,\partial_i\partial_j\xi(\boldsymbol{c})(d_i\nabla c_i)\cdot\nabla c_j\,dxdt \\ -\sum_{i=1}^I \int_0^T\int_\Omega \partial_i\xi(\boldsymbol{c})(d_i\nabla c_i)\cdot\nabla\psi\,dxdt + \sum_{i=1}^I \int_0^T\int_\Omega \partial_i\xi(\boldsymbol{c})R_i(\boldsymbol{c})\psi\,dxdt\end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

holds for almost every $T > 0$, with $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}) = (R_1(\boldsymbol{c}), \dots, R_I(\boldsymbol{c}))$.

Note that the regularity of renormalised solutions is in general insufficient to guarantee the L^1-integrability of the reaction-terms on the right hand side of (1.1) and in the entropy dissipation (1.6). However, sufficiently integrable renormalised solutions are weak solutions, see e.g. [DFPV07, Fis15].

In the present paper, we show results of the form that if a renormalised solution is assumed to satisfies a *weak entropy entropy-dissipation law* (see (1.10) below), then the entropy method implies exponential convergence of the renormalised solution to equilibrium. This includes the cases when renormalised solutions are in fact classical or weak solutions, for which the weak entropy entropy-dissipation law (1.10) can be shown to hold rigorously.

The key lemma of the entropy method is the following EED functional inequality

$$\boxed{\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \ge \lambda(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))} \tag{1.9}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{c} \in L^1(\Omega; [0,+\infty)^I)$ obeying the mass conservation $\mathbb{Q}\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathbf{M}$, and where $\lambda = \lambda(\Omega, \mathbb{D}, \mathbf{M}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^r, \boldsymbol{\beta}^r)$ is a constant depending on the domain Ω, the diffusion coefficients $\mathbb{D}$, the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$ and the stoichiometric coefficients.

Let's assume for the moment that the functional inequality (1.9) is proven. Assume moreover the existence of (classical, weak or renormalised) solutions of the reaction-diffusion system (1.1), which are supposed to satisfy the following weak entropy entropy-dissipation law as a generalised version of (1.6)

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}(t)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}(s))ds \le \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) \quad \text{for a.a. } t > 0. \tag{1.10}$$

Then, by applying the functional inequality (1.9) to such solutions of (1.1)–(1.2), a Gronwall argument (see e.g. [Wil, FL16]) yields exponential convergence in relative entropy with the rate λ, where λ is given in (1.9) and can be explicitly estimated. Moreover, by applying a Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker type inequality (see Section 2) one also obtains L^1-convergence to equilibrium of solutions to (1.1) with the rate $e^{-\lambda t/2}$.

In [MHM15], by using an inspired convexification argument and under the assumption of the detailed balance condition, the authors proved that (1.9) holds for system (1.1)–(1.2) for a $\lambda > 0$ provided that the detailed balance equilibrium (1.7) is the only equilibrium and that there are no boundary equilibria. Moreover, they gave an explicit bound of λ in the case of the quadratic reaction $2\mathcal{C}_1 \leftrightharpoons \mathcal{C}_2$. However, because of the non-convex structure of the problem, obtaining explicit estimates on λ via convexification seems difficult in the case of more than two substances, e.g. for systems like

$$\alpha\mathcal{C}_1 + \beta\mathcal{C}_2 \leftrightharpoons \gamma\mathcal{C}_3 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \leftrightharpoons \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4.$$

By drawing from various previous ideas in [DF08, DF14, FL16, FLT], this paper aims to propose a constructive way to prove *quantitatively* the EED estimate (1.9) for general mass action law reaction-diffusion systems. The main advantage of our method is that, by extensively using the structure of the mass conservation laws, the proof relies on elementary inequalities and has the advantage of providing explicit estimates for the convergence rate λ.

Another advantage of the here-proposed method is its robustness in the sense that it also applies to (bio-)chemical reaction networks where substances are supported on different compartments. In Subsection 5.1, we present that our method directly generalises to a specific example of a volume-surface reaction-diffusion system. Volume-surface reaction-diffusion systems are recently becoming highly relevant models with many applications in cell-biology [NGCRSS07, MS11, FNR13, FRT16, FLT] or also crystal growth [KD01]. We remark that the method of convexification as presented in [MHM15] seems not to apply to such volume-surface reaction-diffusion systems.

The first two main results of this paper will detail the proposed method for two important model systems: a general single reversible reaction with arbitrary number of substances, i.e.

$$\alpha_1\mathcal{A}_1 + \ldots + \alpha_I\mathcal{A}_I \leftrightharpoons \beta_1\mathcal{B}_1 + \ldots + \beta_J\mathcal{B}_J \tag{1.11}$$

and a chain of two reversible reactions, which generalises the Michaels-Menton model for catalytic enzyme kinetics (see e.g. [Mur02])

$$\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \leftrightharpoons \mathcal{C}_3 \leftrightharpoons \mathcal{C}_4 + \mathcal{C}_5. \tag{1.12}$$

Note that for the single reversible reaction (1.11), it is more convenient and consistent with the literature to change the notation compared to (1.1) by splitting the concentration vector $\boldsymbol{c}$ into a left-hand-side and a right-hand-side-concentration vector, i.e.

$$\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_I) \quad \to \quad (\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) = (a_1, \ldots, a_I, b_1, \ldots, b_J),$$

where I denotes now the number of left-hand-side concentrations and J the number of right-hand-side concentrations. This notation allows a clearer presentation of the corresponding system and the proofs.

At first, after assuming (w.l.o.g.) that the forward and backward reaction rate constants are normalised to one, the mass action reaction-diffusion system modelling (1.11) reads as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t a_i - d_{a,i}\Delta a_i = -\alpha_i(\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+, \quad i = 1,2,\ldots,I, \\ \partial_t b_j - d_{b,j}\Delta b_j = \beta_j(\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+, \quad j = 1,2,\ldots,J, \\ \nabla a_i\cdot\nu = \nabla b_j\cdot\nu = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+, \quad i = 1,\ldots,I,\ j = 1,\ldots,J, \\ \boldsymbol{a}(x,0) = \boldsymbol{a}_0(x), \quad \boldsymbol{b}(x,0) = \boldsymbol{b}_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1,\ldots,a_I)$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1,\ldots,b_J)$ denote the two vectors for left- and right-hand side concentrations, $d_{a,i} > 0$ and $d_{b,j} > 0$ are the positive diffusion coefficients, and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_I) \in [1,\infty)^I$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_J) \in [1,\infty)^I$ are the positive vectors of the stoichiometric coefficients assossiated to the single reaction (1.11). Recall that $\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \prod_{i=1}^I a_i^{\alpha_i}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \prod_{j=1}^J b_j^{\beta_j}$.

The system (1.13) possesses the following IJ mass conservation laws

$$\frac{\overline{a_i}}{\alpha_i} + \frac{\overline{b_j}}{\beta_j} = M_{i,j}, \qquad i = 1,\ldots,I, \quad j = 1,\ldots,J, \tag{1.14}$$

from which exactly $m = I + J - 1$ conservation laws are linear independent. That means the matrix $\mathbb{Q}$ in this case has the dimension $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{(I+J-1)\times(I+J)}$. See Lemma 3.1 below for an explicit form of $\mathbb{Q}$. After choosing and fixing $I+J-1$ linear independent components from the IJ conserved masses $(M_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{IJ}$,

we denote by $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{I+J-1}$ the vector of initial masses corresponding to the selected $I+J-1$ coordinates of $(M_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{IJ}$. Thus, by a given initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$, we signify that these $I+J-1$ coordinates are given and the remaining coordinates of $(M_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{IJ}$ are subsequently calculated. The unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty, \boldsymbol{b}_\infty) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{I+J}$ of (1.13) is defined by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{a_{i,\infty}}{\alpha_i} + \frac{b_{j,\infty}}{\beta_j} = M_{i,j} \qquad \forall i = 1,2,\dots,I,\ \forall j = 1,2,\dots,J, \\ \boldsymbol{a}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \boldsymbol{b}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding entropy and entropy-dissipation functionals for system (1.13) are

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \int_\Omega (a_i \log a_i - a_i + 1) dx + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \int_\Omega (b_j \log b_j - b_j + 1) dx \tag{1.15}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \int_\Omega d_{a,i} \frac{|\nabla a_i|^2}{a_i} dx + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \int_\Omega d_{b,j} \frac{|\nabla b_j|^2}{b_j} dx + \int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \log \frac{\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}{\boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} dx, \tag{1.16}$$

respectively.

Theorem 1.2 (Explicit convergence to equilibrium for a general single reversible reaction (1.11))**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume positive diffusion coefficients $d_{a,i} > 0$ and $d_{b,j} > 0$ for all $i = 1,\dots,I$ and $j = 1,\dots,J$. Assume stoichiometric coefficients $\alpha_i \geq 1$ and $\beta_j \geq 1$ for all $i = 1,\dots,I$ and $j = 1,\dots,J$.*

Suppose assumptions (**A1**) *and* (**A2**)*, i.e. that system (1.13) features a unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty, \boldsymbol{b}_\infty)$ of the form (1.7) and no boundary equilibria. Note that for a given positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{I+J-1}$ corresponding to $I+J-1$ linear independent conservation laws (1.14), the assumptions* (**A1**) *and* (**A2**) *are in fact a consequence of Lemma 3.2 and thus satisfied.*

Then, for any nonnegative $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) \in L^1\left(\Omega; [0,\infty)^{I+J}\right)$ satisfying the mass conservation laws (1.14), the following EED estimate

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) \geq \lambda_1 (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty, \boldsymbol{b}_\infty)) \tag{1.17}$$

holds for $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$ defined in (1.15) and (1.16), respectively, and where the constant $\lambda_1 > 0$ can be explicitly *estimated in terms of the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$, the domain Ω, the stoichiometric coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and the diffusion coefficients $d_{a,i}$ and $d_{b,j}$.*

Moreover, for any nonnegative initial data $(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \boldsymbol{b}_0) \in L^1(\Omega)^{I+J}$ with finite entropy, i.e. $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \boldsymbol{b}_0) < +\infty$, there exists a global non-negative renormalised solution $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$ of (1.1)–(1.4) in the sense of Proposition 1.1. Assume that this renormalised solution satisfies the weak entropy entropy-dissipation law (1.10), i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}(t), \boldsymbol{b}(t)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{a}(s), \boldsymbol{b}(s)) ds \leq \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \boldsymbol{b}_0) \quad \text{ for a.a. } t > 0.$$

Then, this renormalised solution of (1.1)–(1.4) converges exponentially to the detailed balance equilibrium $(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty, \boldsymbol{b}_\infty)$ in L^1-norm with the rate $\frac{\lambda_1}{2}$ (as computed in (1.17)), i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I} \|a_i(t) - a_{i,\infty}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \|b_j(t) - b_{j,\infty}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_{CKP}^{-1} (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \boldsymbol{b}_0) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty, \boldsymbol{b}_\infty)) e^{-\lambda_1 t}$$

where C_{CKP} is the constant in a Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequality in Lemma 2.2.

Remark 1.1. *Theorem 1.2 is stated for renormalised solution, which is the only available general concept of global solutions for nonlinear reaction-diffusion systems like (1.1)–(1.2).*

We remark however that the assumed weak entropy entropy-dissipation law (1.10), which holds on the formal level, is unclear for renormalised solutions, because of the lacking integrability of the reaction terms in the entropy dissipation functional (1.16). Hence, our results is formulated for renormalised solutions, which are supposed to satisfy the weak entropy entropy-dissipation law (1.10).

For classical and weak solutions of (1.1)–(1.2), however, the weak entropy entropy-dissipation law (1.10) can typically be verified rigorously (even with an equality sign). This was done, for instance, in [DFPV07] *for weak $(L \log L)^2$-solutions of a system with quadratic nonlinearities (see also Theorem 1.3). More recently, global weak solutions satisfying (1.10) were shown to exist for systems of the form (1.1)–(1.2) in all space dimensions provided a (dimension- and nonlinearity-dependent) "closeness" assumption on the diffusion coefficients, see e.g.* [FL16]*. Imposing a stronger "closeness" assumption on the diffusion coefficients allows to even show the existence of global classical solutions, see e.g.* [FLS16].

Remark 1.2. *Theorem 1.2 generalises the previous results of* [DF06, DF08, GZ10, MHM15, FL16]*, where only special cases of system* (1.13) *were treated.*

As second example (1.12), after assuming (for the sake of simplicity) that all the forward and backward reaction rate constants are normalised to one, the reaction-diffusion system modelling (1.12) reads (by reverting back to the general notation of system (1.1)) as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t c_1 - d_1\Delta c_1 = -c_1c_2 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+,\\ \partial_t c_2 - d_2\Delta c_2 = -c_1c_2 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+,\\ \partial_t c_3 - d_3\Delta c_3 = c_1c_2 + c_4c_5 - 2c_3, & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+,\\ \partial_t c_4 - d_4\Delta c_4 = -c_4c_5 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+,\\ \partial_t c_5 - d_5\Delta c_5 = -c_4c_5 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+,\\ \nabla c_i\cdot\nu = 0, \qquad i=1,2,\dots,5, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+,\\ c_i(x,0) = c_{i,0}(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.18}$$

where $d_i > 0$, $i = 1,\dots 5$, are positive diffusion coefficients. The four mass conservation laws of (1.18) are

$$\overline{c_i} + \overline{c_3} + \overline{c_j} = M_{i,j}, \qquad \forall i\in\{1,2\} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall j\in\{4,5\} \tag{1.19}$$

and among these there are $m = 3$ linear independent conservation laws, thus $\mathbb{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{3\times 5}$. In the following, we denote by $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1,\dots,c_5)$ the concentration vector and by $(M_{i,j}) = (M_{1,4}, M_{1,5}, M_{2,4}, M_{2,5})\in\mathbb{R}^4$ the vector of conserved masses. Note that the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$ is determined by any three coordinates of $(M_{i,j})\in\mathbb{R}^4_+$ corresponding to three linear independent conservation laws and by a given vector $(M_{i,j})\in\mathbb{R}^4_+$ we mean that these three coordinates are given and the remaining coordinate is subsequently calculated. The unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = (c_{1,\infty},\dots,c_{5,\infty})\in\mathbb{R}^5$ to (1.18) is defined by

$$\begin{cases} c_{i,\infty} + c_{3,\infty} + c_{j,\infty} = M_{i,j}, \qquad \forall i\in\{1,2\} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall j\in\{4,5\},\\ c_{1,\infty}c_{2,\infty} = c_{3,\infty},\\ c_{4,\infty}c_{5,\infty} = c_{3,\infty}. \end{cases} \tag{1.20}$$

The corresponding entropy and entropy-dissipation functionals for system (1.18) are

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{i=1}^{5}\int_\Omega (c_i\log c_i - c_i + 1)dx \tag{1.21}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{i=1}^{5}\int_\Omega d_i\frac{|\nabla c_i|^2}{c_i}dx + \int_\Omega \left((c_1c_2 - c_3)\log\frac{c_1c_2}{c_3} + (c_4c_5 - c_3)\log\frac{c_4c_5}{c_3}\right)dx, \tag{1.22}$$

respectively.

Theorem 1.3 (Explicit convergence to equilibrium for the chain reaction (1.12))**.**
Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume positive diffusion coefficients $d_i > 0$ for all $i = 1,\dots,5$.

Suppose assumptions (**A1**)*, i.e. that system* (1.18) *has a unique positive detailed balance equilibrium* (1.20) *and observe that system* (1.18) *has no boundary equilibria. Note that for a given positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}\in\mathbb{R}^3_+$ corresponding to three linear independent conservation laws* (1.19)*, the assumption* (**A1**) *is in fact a consequence of Lemma 4.2 and thus satisfied.*

Then, for any nonnegative function $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1,\dots,c_5)\in L^1\left(\Omega;[0,+\infty)^5\right)$ satisfying the mass conservation laws (1.19)*, the EED estimate*

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)) \tag{1.23}$$

holds for $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c})$ defined in (1.21) *and* (1.22) *respectively, and where $\lambda_2 > 0$ is a positive constant which can be* explicitly *estimated in terms of the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$, the domain Ω and the diffusion coefficients $d_i, i = 1,2,\dots,5$.*

Moreover, for any nonnegative initial data $\mathbf{c}_0\in L^p(\Omega)^5$ for some $p > 2$ (sufficiently close to 2), there exists a global L^p-weak solution $\boldsymbol{c}$ to (1.18)*. These weak solutions satisfy the weak entropy entropy-dissipation law,*

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}(t)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}(s))ds = \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0).$$

Consequently, these weak solutions converge exponentially to the equilibrium, i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{5} \|c_i(t) - c_{i,\infty}\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C^{-1}_{CKP}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))e^{-\lambda_2 t}, \qquad \forall t > 0,$$

where λ_2 is in (1.23) and C_{CKP} is the constant in the Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequality.

The proofs of the above Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 – in particular the corresponding EED estimates – are based on the following If-Theorem 1.4, which can be understood as a proof of concept of how to derive explicit EED estimates for general mass-action-law detailed balance reaction-diffusion systems. More precisely, the following Theorem 1.4 shows that provided the conservation laws of a suitable reaction-diffusion systems are sufficiently explicitly given to prove two natural key inequalities, then an EED estimate with explicitly estimable constants and rates follows from a general method of proof.

Theorem 1.4 (Entropy entropy-dissipation estimates for general detailed balance RD networks (1.1))**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume positive diffusion coefficients $d_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, I$. Assume stoichiometric coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r = (\alpha^r_1, \dots, \alpha^r_I) \in (\{0\} \cup [1, \infty))^I$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^r = (\beta^r_1, \dots, \beta^r_I) \in (\{0\} \cup [1, \infty))^I$ and normalised reaction rate constants $k^r > 0$ as rescaled in (1.4) for all $r = 1, 2, \dots, R$. Suppose assumptions (**A1**) and (**A2**), i.e. that system (1.1)–(1.2) features a unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ of the form (1.7) and no boundary equilibria. The positivity of the detailed balance equilibrium follows, for instance, from supposing a positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$ corresponding to m linear independent conservation laws (1.3), see e.g. [GGH96, Lemma 3.4].*

Moreover, assume

i) that for all bounded states $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} \in [0, K]^I$ (for a $K > 0$ sufficiently large), which satisfy the conservation laws

$$\mathbb{Q}\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathbf{M},$$

there exists a constant $H_4 > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{r=1}^{R} \left[\sqrt{\frac{\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}}{\boldsymbol{c}_\infty}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}}{\boldsymbol{c}_\infty}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right]^2 \geq H_4 \sum_{i=1}^{I} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\overline{c_i}}}{\sqrt{c_{i,\infty}}} - 1 \right)^2, \tag{1.24}$$

ii) and that there exists $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ such that if $\overline{c_{i_0}} \leq \varepsilon^2$ for some $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, I\}$, then we can find $H_5(\varepsilon) > 0$ depending on ε such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I} \|\nabla \sqrt{c_i}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \sum_{r=1}^{R} \left(\overline{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{c}}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{c}}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right)^2 \geq H_5. \tag{1.25}$$

Then, for the entropy and entropy-dissipation functional (1.5) and (1.6), the key entropy entropy-dissipation inequality (1.9), i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \geq \lambda(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))$$

holds true for all $\boldsymbol{c} \in L^1(\Omega; [0, +\infty)^I)$ obeying the mass conservation $\mathbb{Q}\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathbf{M}$, and where $\lambda = \lambda(\Omega, H_4, H_5, \mathbb{D}, \mathbf{M}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^r, \boldsymbol{\beta}^r, k^r)$ is a constant depending explicitly *on the domain Ω, the constants H_4 and H_5, the diffusion coefficients $\mathbb{D}$, the stoichiometric coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r, \boldsymbol{\beta}^r$, the reaction rate constants k^r, and the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$.*

The first assumption (1.24) in Theorem 1.4 can be either interpreted as a quantitative version of the uniqueness of the positive detailed balance equilibrium (1.7) or an kind of EED estimate (w.r.t. L^2-distances of square-roots of concentrations) for the ODE system associated to (1.1)–(1.2). Indeed, both viewpoints reflect the observation that the positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ balances all reactions (in fact the left hand side of (1.24) is precisely zero for all states $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}$, which balance all reactions) and satisfies all conservation law $\mathbb{Q}\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathbf{M}$. These two conditions uniquely define the positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$, which is the only state for which the right hand side of (1.24) is zero. Moreover, considering bounded states $0 \leq \overline{\boldsymbol{c}} \leq K$ constitutes no relevant restriction since Lemma 2.1 below will show that all solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) with bounded initial relative entropy satisfy naturally uniform-in-time bounds $0 \leq \overline{\boldsymbol{c}} \leq K$ for some sufficiently large constant $K > 0$.

We remark that inequality (1.24) can be shown to hold with an explicit constant via Taylor expansion for states $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}$ near the equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$, yet this is insufficient to prove an explicit bound for the constant H_4 for states $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}$ far from equilibrium due to the non-convexity of the problem, see [MHM15].

In our proof of the Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, we present a global method of proving inequality (1.24) with an explicit bound for H_4. The key to this proof is to exploit the structure of the corresponding

conservations laws (1.14) and (1.19), respectively. In fact, for the proof of Theorem 1.2, it is sufficient to observe that the conservations laws (1.14) entail some qualitative sign relations between the states $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}$ around the equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$.

The second inequality (1.25) is a quantified version of the natural observation that all states $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}$, for which less than a sufficiently small amount of mass is present in at least on concentration $\overline{c_{i_0}} < \varepsilon$ (recall that the detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ contains a fixed positive amount of mass in all concentrations), are necessarily far from equilibrium in the sense that left hand side of (1.25), which is a lower bound for the entropy dissipation D (see Section 2.2), is itself bounded below by a positive constant $H_5(\varepsilon)$. More precisely, (1.25) can be interpretated that such states are either inhomogeneous in space and thus dissipate entropy in terms of the Fisher information (which is the first term on the left hand side of (1.25)) or that such states are still subject to a significant amount of chemical reactions and thus dissipate entropy in terms of the second term on the left hand side of (1.25). The inequality (1.25) also reflects the fact that the considered system possess no boundary equilibria, and that the entropy dissipation is bounded away from zero when the concentration is close to the boundary $\partial\mathbb{R}^I_+$.

Finally, we remark our believe that our method of proving the inequalities (1.24) and (1.25) in Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 should also apply to any other systems of the form (1.1)–(1.2), once the structure of the conservation laws is sufficiently explicitly given. The main reason for having to state Theorem 1.4 as an If-Theorem by assuming the inequalities (1.24) and (1.25) is the fact that we do not know how to provide an explicit proof of these two natural inequalities only based on the pure existence of the matrix $\mathbb{Q}$, without knowledge of its structure which formalises the conservation laws.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we first provide preliminary estimates and results before proving Theorem 1.4 for general systems of the form (1.1)–(1.2). The proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are presented in Sections 3 and 4 respectively. Finally, we discuss the further possible applications and some open problems in Section 5.

2. The general method

In this section, we first briefly state preliminary estimates and inequalities of the mass action reaction-diffusion systems (1.1)–(1.6) before we present the details of our proposed method.

The following notations and elementary inequalities are used in our proof:

$L^2(\Omega)$-norm:

For the rest of this paper, we will denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the usual norm of $L^2(\Omega)$: $\|f\|^2 = \int_\Omega |f(x)|^2\,dx$.

Spatial averages and square-root abbreviation:

For a function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, the spatial average is denoted by (recall $|\Omega| = 1$)

$$\overline{f} = \int_\Omega f(x)\,dx.$$

Moreover, for a quantity denoted by small letters, we introduce the short hand notation of the same uppercase letter as its square root, e.g.

$$C_i = \sqrt{c_i}, \quad \text{and} \quad C_{i,\infty} = \sqrt{c_{i,\infty}}.$$

Additivity of Entropy: see e.g. [DF08, DF14], [MHM15, Lemma 2.3]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) &= (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}})) + (\mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^I \int_\Omega c_i \log\frac{c_i}{\overline{c}_i} dx + \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\overline{c}_i \log\frac{\overline{c}_i}{c_{i,\infty}} - \overline{c}_i + c_{i,\infty}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

The Poincaré inequality: For all $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, there exists $C_P(\Omega) > 0$ depending only on Ω such that

$$\|\nabla f\|^2 \geq C_P \|f - \overline{f}\|^2.$$

The Logarithmic Sobolev inequality: There exists $C_{LSI} > 0$ depending only on Ω such that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla f|^2}{f} dx \geq C_{LSI} \int_\Omega f \log\frac{f}{\overline{f}} dx. \tag{2.2}$$

An elementary inequality: $(a-b)(\log a - \log b) \geq 4\big(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b}\big)^2$.

An elementary function:

Consider $\Phi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ defined as (and continuously extended at $z = 0, 1$)

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{z \log z - z + 1}{\left(\sqrt{z} - 1\right)^2}. \tag{2.3}$$

Then, Φ is increasing with $\lim_{z\to 0} \Phi(z) = 1$ and $\lim_{z\to 1} \Phi(z) = 2$.

2.1. **Preliminary estimates and inequalities.**

Lemma 2.1 (L^1-bounds)**.** *Assume that the initial data $\boldsymbol{c}_0$ are nonnegative and satisfies $\mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}_0}) < +\infty$. Then, the non-negative renormalised solutions to (1.1)–(1.4) satisfy*

$$\|c_i(t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \le K := 2(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) + I) \qquad \forall t > 0, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, I.$$

Proof. For global weak or classical solutions of (1.1)–(1.4), integration of (1.6) over $(0, t)$ leads to $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{c}(t)) \le \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{c}_0)$, which yields directly the statement of the lemma (see also below). However, for renormalised solutions, we remark that the lack of regularity prevents direct integration of (1.6). To overcome this difficulty, we follow the construction of renormalised solutions, see e.g. [Fis15, Lemma 1], and consider for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the approximating weak solution $\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon$ of the following approximation of (1.1)

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon - \mathbb{D}\Delta \boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon = \frac{\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)}{1 + \varepsilon|\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)|} \tag{2.4}$$

subject to homogeneous Neumann boundary condition $\nabla \boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0$ and initial condition $\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon(x, 0) = \boldsymbol{c}_0^\varepsilon(x)$ where $\boldsymbol{c}_0^\varepsilon$ is a suitable smooth approximation of $\boldsymbol{c}_0$. We can also define the entropy and entropy-dissipation functionals corresponding to (2.4) in a similar way to (1.5) and (1.6) as

$$\mathcal{E}^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^I \int_\Omega (c_i^\varepsilon \log c_i^\varepsilon - c_i^\varepsilon + 1)\, dx \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^I \int_\Omega d_i \frac{|\nabla c_i^\varepsilon|^2}{c_i^\varepsilon} dx + \sum_{r=1}^R k^r \int_\Omega \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon|\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)|} ((\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - (\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r})(\log(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \log(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r})\, dx \tag{2.6}$$

Note that the approximating solutions $\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon$ are sufficiently regular to satisfy

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon) = -\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon) \le 0$$

and hence

$$\mathcal{E}^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon)(t) \le \mathcal{E}^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{c}_0^\varepsilon) \qquad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Due to [Fis15, Lemma 2], $\boldsymbol{c}^\varepsilon$ converges to $\boldsymbol{c}$ almost everywhere for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, +\infty)$. Moreover, we recall that $\boldsymbol{c}_0^\varepsilon$ is a smooth approximation of $\boldsymbol{c}_0$. Then, thanks to the Fatou's lemma, we can pass to the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ and obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c})(t) \le \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) \qquad \text{for all } t > 0 \tag{2.7}$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \int_\Omega (c_i(x, t) \log c_i(x, t) - c_i(x, t) + 1)\, dx \le \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) \qquad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

By using the elementary inequalities $x \log x - x + 1 \ge \left(\sqrt{x} - 1\right)^2 \ge \frac{1}{2}x - 1$ for all $x \ge 0$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^I \int_\Omega c_i(x, t)\, dx \le \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) + I.$$

This, combined with the non-negativity of solutions, completes the proof of the Lemma. ∎

The following Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker type inequality shows that $L^1(\Omega)$-convergence to equilibrium follows from convergence of solutions in relative entropy $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)$. For a generalised Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequality, we refer to [AMTU01]. Here, we give an elementary proof using only the natural bounds given in Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.2 (Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker type inequality). *For all $\boldsymbol{c} \in L^1(\Omega;[0,+\infty)^I)$ such that $\mathbb{Q}\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathbb{Q}\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ and $\overline{c}_i \le K$ for all $i = 1,2,\dots,I$ with some $K > \max_i\{c_{i,\infty}\} > 0$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \ge C_{CKP} \sum_{i=1}^I \|c_i - c_{i,\infty}\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)}$$

where the constant C_{CKP} depends only on the domain Ω and the constant K.

Proof. By recalling $|\Omega| = 1$ and using the additivity of the relative entropy, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = \sum_{i=1}^I \int_\Omega c_i \log\frac{c_i}{\overline{c}_i} dx + \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\overline{c}_i \log\frac{\overline{c}_i}{c_{i,\infty}} - \overline{c}_i + c_{i,\infty}\right). \tag{2.8}$$

By using the classical Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequality, we have

$$\int_\Omega c_i \log\frac{c_i}{\overline{c}_i} dx \ge C_0 \|c_i - \overline{c}_i\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} \tag{2.9}$$

for all $i = 1,2,\dots,I$, where the constant C_0 depends only on the domain Ω. On the other hand, by applying the elementary inequality $x\log(x/y) - x + y \ge (\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y})^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) &= \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\overline{c}_i \log\frac{\overline{c}_i}{c_{i,\infty}} - \overline{c}_i + c_{i,\infty}\right) \ge \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\sqrt{\overline{c}_i} - \sqrt{c_{i,\infty}}\right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{(\overline{c}_i - c_{i,\infty})^2}{\left(\sqrt{\overline{c}_i} + \sqrt{c_{i,\infty}}\right)^2} \\ &\ge \frac{1}{4K}\sum_{i=1}^I (\overline{c}_i - c_{i,\infty})^2,\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where K is given in Lemma 2.1. By combining (2.8)–(2.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) &\ge C_0 \sum_{i=1}^I \|c_i - \overline{c}_i\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{4K}\sum_{i=1}^I (\overline{c}_i - c_{i,\infty})^2 \\ &\ge \min\{C_0; 1/4K\} \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\|c_i - \overline{c}_i\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|\overline{c}_i - c_{i,\infty}\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)}\right) \\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}\min\{C_0; 1/4K\} \sum_{i=1}^I \|c_i - c_{i,\infty}\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired inequality with $C_{CKP} = \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{C_0; \frac{1}{4K}\right\}$. ∎

The following entropy entropy-dissipation estimate was established in [MHM15].

Theorem 2.3. [MHM15] *Assume that (1.1)–(1.2) satisfies the assumption (**A1**) and (**A2**).*

Then, for a given positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$ and for all $\boldsymbol{c} \in L^1(\Omega;[0,+\infty)^I)$ satisfying $\mathbb{Q}\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathbf{M}$, there exists a positive constant $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \ge \lambda(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))$$

with $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c})$ given in (1.5) and (1.6), respectively, and where $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ is the detailed balance equilibrium of (1.1) corresponding to $\mathbf{M}$.

We emphasise that, though this Theorem gives the existence of $\lambda > 0$, it seems difficult to extract an explicit estimate of λ except in some special cases, e.g. the quadratic system arising from the reaction $2\mathcal{C}_1 \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{C}_2$. The main reason is the (highly elegant) convexification argument used in [MHM15], which seems very difficult (if not impossible) to make explicit for general systems.

In this paper, we propose a constructive method to prove an EED estimate. The method applies elementary estimates and has the advantage of allowing to explicitly estimate the rates and constants of convergence to equilibrium. Before detailing our approach, we shall further remark on assumption (**A2**) on the absence of boundary equilibria.

Remark 2.1 (Boundary equilibrium). *The validity of Theorem 2.3 fails if the system (1.1) has a boundary equilibrium. As example, consider the single reversible reaction $2\mathcal{A} \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B}$ with normalised reaction*

rate constants $k_f = k_b = 1$, which leads to the following system

$$\begin{cases} a_t - d_a\Delta a = -a^2 + ab, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ b_t - d_b\Delta b = a^2 - ab, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ \nabla a \cdot \nu = \nabla b \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ a(x,0) = a_0(x),\ b(x,0) = b_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and where we assume that $d_a, d_b > 0$. This system has one mass conservation law

$$\int_\Omega (a(x,t) + b(x,t))dx = \int_\Omega (a_0(x) + b_0(x))dx =: \mathbf{M} > 0 \qquad \forall t > 0.$$

It is easy to see that the system possesses the positive detailed balance equilibrium $(a_\infty, b_\infty) = \left(\frac{\mathbf{M}}{2}, \frac{\mathbf{M}}{2}\right)$ and the boundary equilibrium $(a^*_\infty, b^*_\infty) = (0, \mathbf{M})$. Moreover, we have the entropy functional

$$\mathcal{E}(a,b) = \int_\Omega (a\log a - a + 1)dx + \int_\Omega (b\log b - b + 1)dx$$

and the entropy-dissipation functional

$$\mathcal{D}(a,b) = \int_\Omega d_a \frac{|\nabla a|^2}{a}dx + \int_\Omega d_b \frac{|\nabla b|^2}{b}dx + \int_\Omega a(a-b)(\log a - \log b)dx.$$

By defining $Z = \{(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+ : a + b = \mathbf{M}\}$, we can easily compute that

$$\lim_{Z \ni (a,b) \to (a^*_\infty, b^*_\infty)} \mathcal{D}(a,b) = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{Z \ni (a,b) \to (a^*_\infty, b^*_\infty)} (\mathcal{E}(a,b) - \mathcal{E}(a_\infty, b_\infty)) = \mathbf{M}\log 2 > 0.$$

As a consequence, there does not exist a constant $\lambda > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{D}(a,b) \geq \lambda(\mathcal{E}(a,b) - \mathcal{E}(a_\infty, b_\infty))$$

for all functions $a, b : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $\int_\Omega (a(x) + b(x))dx = \mathbf{M}$.

Therefore, if (1.1)–(1.2) has a boundary equilibrium then we cannot expect in general global exponential convergence to equilibrium. We can only expect exponential convergence of trajectories, which are uniformly bounded away from the boundary equilibrium. Interestingly, it is conjectured in the case of ODE reaction systems that for complex balanced reaction systems, even if the system possesses boundary equilibria, a trajectory starting from any other positive initial state will always converge to the unique positive equilibrium as time goes to infinity. This conjecture is given the name Global Attractor Conjecture *in [CDSS09] and is considered to be one of the most important open problems in the theory of chemical reaction networks. A recent proposed proof of the conjecture in ODE setting is under verification [Cra].*

For PDE systems featuring boundary equilibria, we refer the reader to [DFT, GH97].

2.2. **A constructive method to prove the EED estimate.** Alhough Theorem 2.3 provides the existence of $\lambda > 0$ satisfying the entropy entropy-dissipation estimate, it does not seem to allow for explicit estimates on λ when the reaction network has more than two substances, for example,

$$\alpha\mathcal{C}_1 + \beta\mathcal{C}_2 \leftrightharpoons \gamma\mathcal{C}_3 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \leftrightharpoons \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4.$$

Inspired by [DF08, DF14, FLT, FL16], we propose a general approach to prove an entropy entropy-dissipation estimate based on the mass conservation laws of a reaction-diffusion system of the form (1.1)–(1.2), which allows explicit estimates of the rates and constants of convergence.

By recalling the key EED estimate

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \geq \lambda(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)), \tag{2.11}$$

with $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c})$ are given in (1.5) and (1.6), we point out that the right hand side is zero if and only if $\boldsymbol{c} \equiv \boldsymbol{c}_\infty$, while the left hand side is zero for all constant states $\boldsymbol{c}^* \in (0, +\infty)^I$ satisfying $(\boldsymbol{c}^*)^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} = (\boldsymbol{c}^*)^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}$, $\forall r = 1, 2, \ldots, R$ and that $\boldsymbol{c}^*$ identifies with $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ if and only if $\mathbb{Q}\,\boldsymbol{c}^* = \mathbf{M}$. Hence, the EED estimate (2.11) has to crucially take into account all the conservations laws of the system.

Remark 2.2 (Explicit constants)**.** *We remark that the rates obtained by our approach are not optimal. Therefore, for the sake of readability, we shall denote at some places by K_i constants, which can be estimated explicitly, but for which we don't state unnecessary long expressions.*

The aim of this subsection is to prove Theorem 1.4. Once this theorem is proved, it remains only to prove the finite dimensional inequality (1.24) and the lower bound for entropy dissipation (1.25) in order to apply Theorem 1.4 in the proofs of the Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 as presented in Sections 3 and 4. There, the proofs of the inequalities (1.24) and (1.25) are crucially based on the structure of the mass conservation laws (1.14) and (1.19), respectively.

We first prove the following intermediate lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Consider the general mass-action law reaction-diffusion system (1.1)–(1.2) with the associated entropy and entropy-dissipation functionals (1.5) and (1.6).*

Assume that there exists a constant H_6 such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I} \|\nabla C_i\|^2 + \sum_{r=1}^{R} \left(\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}\right)^2 \geq H_6 \sum_{i=1}^{I} \left(\sqrt{\overline{C_i^2}} - C_{i,\infty}\right)^2, \tag{2.12}$$

where we recall the short hand notation $C_i = \sqrt{c_i}$, $C_{i,\infty} = \sqrt{c_{i,\infty}}$, e.t.c.

Then, for all non-negative $\boldsymbol{c} \in L^1(\Omega; [0,+\infty)^I)$ with $\overline{c_i} \leq K$, there holds

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \geq \lambda(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))$$

for $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c})$ as given in (1.5) and (1.6) and for a constant $\lambda > 0$ depending explicitly *on H_6 and K, the domain Ω, the diffusion coefficients d_i, the stoichiometric coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r, \boldsymbol{\beta}^r$, the reaction rate constants k_r, and the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$.*

Proof. The proof of this lemma is devided into three steps.

Step 1 (Use of the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality):
The idea of this step is to divide the relative entropy $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)$ into two parts by using the additivity properties of the entropy (2.1):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) &= (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}})) + (\mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{I} \int_\Omega c_i \log \frac{c_i}{\overline{c_i}} dx + \sum_{i=1}^{I} \left(\overline{c_i} \log \frac{\overline{c_i}}{c_{i,\infty}} - \overline{c_i} + c_{i,\infty}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

where the first part is controlled in terms (of a part of) the Fisher information in the entropy dissipation via the lower bounds $d_i \geq d_{min}$ and the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality, i.e.

$$\int_\Omega d_i \frac{|\nabla c_i|^2}{c_i} dx \geq C_{LSI}\, d_{min} \int_\Omega c_i \log \frac{c_i}{\overline{c_i}} dx, \qquad \forall i = 1, \ldots, I$$

and the second term on the right hand side of (2.13) depends only on spatial averages of concentrations, which have the two advantages of obeying the conservation laws and of satisfying the natural uniform a-priori bounds of Lemma 2.1.

In particular, the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality allows to estimate

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \geq \frac{1}{2} C_{LSI}\, d_{min} (\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}})). \tag{2.14}$$

Step 2 (Transformation into quadratic terms for the square roots of the concentrations):
We estimate (the remaining part of) $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c})$ as well as $\mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)$ in terms of L^2-distance of the square roots C_i of the concentrations c_i. The associated L^2-norms are significantly easier to handle than logarithmic terms. For $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c})$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{I} \int_\Omega d_i \frac{|\nabla c_i|^2}{c_i} dx + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{R} k^r \int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r})(\log \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \log \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}) dx \\ &\geq 2 d_{min} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \|\nabla C_i\|^2 + 2 \sum_{r=1}^{R} k^r \left\| \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right\|^2 \\ &\geq K_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{I} \|\nabla C_i\|^2 + \sum_{r=1}^{R} \left\| \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right\|^2 \right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

with

$$K_1 = 2 \min\{d_{min}, \min_{r=1,\ldots,R} \{k^r\}\}, \tag{2.16}$$

and we recall the abbreviations $C_i = \sqrt{c_i}$, $\boldsymbol{c} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_I)^\top$ and the elementary inequality $(a-b)(\log a - \log b) \geq 4(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b})^2$.

For the second terms on the right hand side of (2.13), we use the function Φ in (2.3) to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) &= \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\overline{c_i} \log \frac{\overline{c_i}}{c_{i,\infty}} - \overline{c_i} + c_{i,\infty} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^I \Phi\left(\frac{\overline{c_i}}{c_{i,\infty}} \right) \left(\sqrt{\overline{c_i}} - \sqrt{c_{i,\infty}} \right)^2 \\ &\leq K_2 \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\sqrt{\overline{C_i^2}} - C_{i,\infty} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

with

$$K_2 = \max_{i=1,\dots,I} \left\{ \Phi\left(\frac{K}{c_{i,\infty}} \right) \right\}, \tag{2.18}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.1 to estimate $\overline{c_i} \leq K$ for all $i = 1, \dots, I$, and the monotonicity of the function Φ.

Step 3 (Control of reaction dissipation term by a reaction dissipation term for averages): The estimate (2.15) is a proper lower bound of the entropy dissipation $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c})$ in the sense that all the conservation laws are required in order to see that the right hand side of (2.15) is zero only at the equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$. In this step, we continue to estimate below the right hand side of (2.15) in terms of the left hand side of (2.12).

Indeed, the two terms on right hand side of (2.15) represents lower bounds for the entropy-dissipation caused by all the diffusion and reaction processes of the considered system. In order to be able to use the constrains provided by the conservation laws, we shall bound the reaction dissipation term below by a reaction dissipation term for spatially averaged concentrations. More precisely, by denoting $\overline{\mathbf{C}} = (\overline{C_1}, \dots, \overline{C_I})^\top$, we have

Lemma 2.5 (Reaction dissipation terms for averaged concentrations)**.**
Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.4, there exists an explicit constant $K_3 > 0$ such that

$$2\|\nabla C_i\|^2 + 2\sum_{r=1}^R \left\| \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right\|^2 \geq K_3 \Big(\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2 + \sum_{r=1}^R \left(\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right)^2 \Big). \tag{2.19}$$

It's worth noticing that comparing to a related estimate in [DF08], where the considered quadratic nonlinearities allowed to exploit certain L^2-orthogonality structures, Lemma 2.5 is significantly more complicated due to the arbitrary order of the considered nonlinearities. In the proof of Lemma 2.5, we shall introduce some new ideas, which are motivated by [FL16] and consist of a domain decomposition to overcome the difficulties caused by the general nonlinearities. This idea is also applicable to volume-surface reaction-diffusion systems, see [FLT].

Proof of Lemma 2.5. We first prove that

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2 + 2\sum_{r=1}^R \left\| \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right\|^2 \geq \kappa \sum_{r=1}^R \left(\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right)^2 \tag{2.20}$$

for an explicit constant $\kappa > 0$. Then, (2.19) follows by choosing

$$K_3 = \min\{1, \kappa\}.$$

The proof of (2.20) introduces pointwise deviations of the concentrations around their spatial averages, which are defined as follows: for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$, we set

$$\delta_i(x) = C_i(x) - \overline{C}_i, \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega.$$

Thanks to the non-negativity of C_i and Lemma 2.1, we have that $\delta_i \in [-\sqrt{K}; +\infty)$. Fixing a constant $L > \sqrt{K} > 0$, we can decompose Ω as

$$\Omega = S \cup S^\perp,$$

where

$$S = \{x \in \Omega : |\delta_i(x)| \leq L, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, I\}.$$

We will prove (2.20) on both S and $S^\perp$. On S we estimate for a $\gamma \in (0,2)$ by using Taylor expansion (i.e. $\prod_{i=1}^I (\overline{C}_i+\delta_i)^{\alpha_i^r} = \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} + \sum_{i=1}^I R_i(\overline{\mathbf{C}}, \alpha_i^r, \delta)\delta_i$ with bounded remainders $|R_i(\overline{\mathbf{C}}, \alpha_i^r, \delta)| \le C(K, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^r, L)$) and Young's inequality that

$$\gamma \sum_{r=1}^R \left\| \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right\|^2_{L^2(S)} = \gamma \sum_{r=1}^R \left\| \prod_{i=1}^I (\overline{C}_i+\delta_i)^{\alpha_i^r} - \prod_{i=1}^I (\overline{C}_i+\delta_i)^{\beta_i^r} \right\|^2_{L^2(S)} \tag{2.21}$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{2}\gamma \sum_{r=1}^R \left[\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right]^2 |S| - \gamma\, C(L) \sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2_{L^2(S)}, \tag{2.22}$$

where $C(L)$ is an explicit constant which *does not* depend on S. On the other hand, by using the Poincaré inequality,

$$\|\nabla f\|^2 \ge C_P \|f - \overline{f}\|^2 \ge C_P \|f - \overline{f}\|^2_{L^2(S)},$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2 \ge \frac{1}{2} C_P \sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2 \ge \frac{1}{2} C_P \sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2_{L^2(S)}. \tag{2.23}$$

From (2.21) and (2.23), if we choose $\gamma \in (0,2)$ such that $2\gamma C(L) \le C_P$, then we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2 + 2\sum_{r=1}^R \left\| \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \mathbf{C}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right\|^2_{L^2(S)} \ge \frac{1}{2}\gamma \sum_{r=1}^R \left[\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right]^2 |S|. \tag{2.24}$$

To estimate (2.20) on $S^\perp$, we note that by the definition of $S^\perp$ and L, we have

$$S^\perp = \{x \in \Omega : \quad \delta_i(x) > L \ \text{ for some } \ i = 1, 2 \ldots, I\}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |S^\perp| &= \sum_{i=1}^I |\{x \in \Omega : \delta_i(x) > L\}| = \sum_{i=1}^I \left|\{x \in \Omega : \delta_i^2(x) > L^2\}\right| \\ &\le \frac{1}{L^2}\sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2 \le \frac{1}{L^2 C_P}\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

By making use of the a priori bounds $\overline{C_i} \le \sqrt{\overline{C_i^2}} \le \sqrt{K}$ from Lemma 2.1, we can estimate the right hand side of (2.20) restricted onto $S^\perp$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=1}^R \left[\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r} \right]^2 |S^\perp| &\le C(\sqrt{K})\,|S^\perp| \le \frac{C(\sqrt{K})}{L^2 C_P}\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2 \qquad \text{(use (2.25))} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

if we choose L to be big enough, e.g. $L^2 \ge \frac{2C(\sqrt{K})}{C_P}$. By combining (2.24) and (2.26) we obtain (2.20) with $\kappa = \frac{1}{2}\min\{1, \gamma\}$. This ends the proof of Lemma 2.5. ∎

Continuation of the proof of Lemma 2.4
Now, by combining the estimates (2.15), (2.17) and (2.19), and the assumption (2.12) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \ge \frac{K_1 K_3 H_6}{2K_2}\left(\mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)\right). \tag{2.27}$$

Therefore, we finally obtain the desired entropy entropy-dissipation estimate $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) \ge \lambda(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))$ from (2.13), (2.14) and (2.27) with

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{ C_{LSI} d_{min}; \frac{K_1 K_3 H_6}{K_2} \right\}$$

where K_1 and K_2 are defined in (2.16) and (2.18) respectively, and K_3 is in Lemma 2.5. ∎

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4.
Thanks to Lemma 2.4, it remains to prove (2.12) under the assumptions (1.24) and (1.25). In order to do that, we exploit the ansatz

$$\overline{C_i^2} = C_{i,\infty}^2(1+\mu_i)^2 \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1,\dots,I \tag{2.28}$$

or equivalently

$$\overline{\mathbf{C}^2} = \mathbf{C}_\infty^2(\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{\mu})^2$$

with $\mathbf{1} = (1,1,\dots,1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^I$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1,\dots,\mu_I)^\top$, where the non-negativity of the concentrations implies that $\boldsymbol{\mu} \geq -\mathbf{1}$. Note that $\overline{C_i^2} = \overline{c_i} \leq K$ (see Lemma 2.1), thus

$$-1 \leq \mu_i \leq \mu_{max} < +\infty \quad \text{for all } i = 1,\dots,I.$$

By recalling that $\mathbf{C}^2 = \boldsymbol{c}$ and $\mathbf{C}_\infty^2 = \boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ and $\mathbb{Q}\,\overline{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbb{Q}\,\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = \mathbf{M}$, we have moreover the following algebraic constrains between the $\mu_1,\dots,\mu_I$:

$$\mathbb{Q}\,\mathbf{C}_\infty^2(\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{\mu})^2 = \mathbb{Q}\,\mathbf{C}_\infty^2$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbb{Q}\,\mathbf{C}_\infty^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}^2+2\boldsymbol{\mu}) = 0.$$

By denoting $\delta_i(x) = C_i(x) - \overline{C_i}$ the deviation of $C_i(x)$ to its average and by using (2.28), it follows from $\|\delta_i\|^2 = \overline{C_i^2} - \overline{C_i}^2$ that

$$\overline{C_i} = \sqrt{\overline{C_i^2}} - \frac{\|\delta_i\|^2}{\sqrt{\overline{C_i^2}} + \overline{C_i}} =: C_{i,\infty}(1+\mu_i) - \|\delta_i\|^2 R(C_i), \tag{2.29}$$

where we denote $R(C_i) := \left(\sqrt{\overline{C_i^2}} + \overline{C_i}\right)^{-1}$ for all $i = 1,\dots,I$. We observe that $R(C_i)$ becomes unbounded when $\overline{C_i^2} \geq \overline{C_i}^2$ approaches zero. The possible occurrence of such degenerate states (with arbitrarily little mass $\overline{C_i^2}$ of the species $\mathcal{A}_i$ being present) prevents a uniform use of the ansatz (2.29). Therefore, we have to distinguish two cases where $\overline{C_i^2}$ is either "big" or "small". Let ε be as in assumption ii) of Theorem 1.4. We consider two cases.

Case 1: When $\overline{C_i^2} \geq \varepsilon^2$ for all $i = 1,\dots,I$. In this case, we have

$$R(C_i) = \left(\sqrt{\overline{C_i^2}} + \overline{C_i}\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \qquad \forall i = 1,2,\dots,I.$$

Thus, we can estimate the left hand side of (2.12) for a $\theta \in (0,1)$ to be chosen (and by using Poincaré's inequality, the boundedness of $\|\delta_i\|$ and the boundedness of μ_i), as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LSH of (2.12)} &\geq C_P \sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2 + \theta \sum_{r=1}^R \Bigg[\prod_{i=1}^I \left(C_{i,\infty}(1+\mu_i) - \|\delta_i\|^2 R(C_i)\right)^{\alpha_i^r} \\
&\qquad\qquad - \prod_{i=1}^I \left(C_{i,\infty}(1+\mu_i) - \|\delta_i\|^2 R(C_i)\right)^{\beta_i^r}\Bigg]^2 \\
&\geq C_P \sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2 + \theta \sum_{r=1}^R \left[\mathbf{C}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r}(\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{\mu})^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \mathbf{C}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}(\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{\mu})^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}\right]^2 - \theta\, C(\varepsilon,K) \sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2 \\
&\geq \theta \min_{r=1,\dots,R}\left\{\mathbf{C}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r}\right\}^2 \sum_{r=1}^R \left[(\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{\mu})^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - (\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{\mu})^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}\right]^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

where we have used the detailed balance condition, $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} = \boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}$ and chosen $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that $\theta C(\varepsilon,K) \leq C_P$ where $C(\varepsilon,K)$ is a constant explicitly depends on ε and K. Now, by using (1.24) rewritten in the variables (2.28), i.e. $\sqrt{\overline{c_i}} = \sqrt{c_{i,\infty}}(1+\mu_i)$ and

$$\sum_{r=1}^R \left[(1+\boldsymbol{\mu})^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - (1+\boldsymbol{\mu})^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}\right]^2 \geq H_4 \sum_{i=1}^I \mu_i^2 \tag{2.31}$$

for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [-1, \mu_{max}]^I$, we continue to estimate (2.30) below

$$\begin{aligned}\text{RHS of (2.30)} &\geq \theta \min_{r=1,\dots,R} \left\{\mathbf{C}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r}\right\}^2 H_4 \sum_{i=1}^I \mu_i^2 \\ &= \theta \min_{r=1,\dots,R} \left\{\mathbf{C}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r}\right\}^2 H_4 \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{\left(\sqrt{C_i^2} - C_{i,\infty}\right)^2}{C_{i,\infty}^2} \qquad \text{(by using (2.28))} \\ &\geq \left(\theta \min_{r=1,\dots,R} \left\{\mathbf{C}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r}\right\}^2 \frac{H_4}{\max_i C_{i,\infty}^2}\right) \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\sqrt{C_i^2} - C_{i,\infty}\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (2.12) follows with

$$H_6 = \theta \min_{r=1,\dots,R} \left\{\mathbf{C}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r}\right\}^2 \frac{H_4}{\max_i C_{i,\infty}^2}.$$

Case 2: When $\overline{C_{i_0}^2} \leq \varepsilon^2$ for some $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, I\}$. In this case, we only need to bound the right hand side of (2.12) above since the left hand side of (2.12) is bounded below by a positive constant in terms of the assumed inequality (1.25) and, thus, (2.12) holds true for a sufficiently small constant H_6.

Thanks to the boundedness of averaged concentrations $\overline{c_i} \leq K$ in Lemma 2.1 and consequently $c_{i,\infty} \leq K$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \left(\sqrt{C_i^2} - C_{i,\infty}\right)^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\overline{C_i^2} + C_{i,\infty}^2\right) \leq 4IK. \tag{2.32}$$

Hence, it follows from (1.25) that

$$\text{LHS of (2.12)} \geq H_5 \geq \frac{H_5}{4IK} \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\sqrt{C_i^2} - C_{i,\infty}\right)^2$$

or equivalently (2.12) holds with

$$H_6 = \frac{H_5}{4IK}.$$

This finishes the proof the Theorem 1.4. ∎

Remark 2.3 (How to prove (1.24) and (1.25))**.**
The reason that prevents us to prove (1.24) *and* (1.25) *for general systems of the form* (1.1)–(1.4) *is that we need some explicit structure of the conservation laws. However, to categorise the structure of the conservation laws of general systems is unclear. We will show for the two specific systems in Sections 3 and 4 that once the conservation laws are explicitly known, we can establish the inequalities* (1.24) *and* (1.25) *explicitly and thus complete the explicit proof of the entropy entropy-dissipation inequality* (1.9).

This remark provides an outline of how to obtain (1.24) *and* (1.25) *for a specific system (see Sections 3 and 4 for details).*

i) From the conservation law constraints assumed in (1.24) *and the ansatz* (2.28)*, we have*

$$\mathbb{Q}\mathbf{C}_\infty^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}^2 + 2\boldsymbol{\mu}) = 0$$

and consequently some sign relations between μ_i, which allow to prove (1.24) *(see Lemmas 3.3 and 4.3).*

ii) To show (1.25) *for states, where (at least) one of the concentration contains less than a sufficiently small amount of mass, let's say $\overline{C_{i_0}^2} \leq \varepsilon^2$, we distinguish two cases depending on diffusion being "big" or "small". In the former case, the lower bound H_6 follows from the diffusion part $\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla C_i\|^2$, while in the latter case the reaction part $\sum_{r=1}^R \left(\overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^r} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^r}\right)^2$ gives the lower bound H_6 (see Lemmas 3.4 and 4.4).*

We believe that the strategies i) and ii) are applicable to a large class of systems once the conservation laws are explicitly given. We refer the reader to e.g. [DFT, FLT, Jan15, FL16] *where (parts of) the above strategies were already apply.*

3. A single reversible reaction - Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.2 and in particular the entropy entropy-dissipation estimate (1.17) with an explicit constant λ_1, which yields convergence to equilibrium for a general single reversible reaction of the form

$$\alpha_1\mathcal{A}_1 + \alpha_2\mathcal{A}_2 + \ldots + \alpha_I\mathcal{A}_I \leftrightharpoons \beta_1\mathcal{B}_1 + \beta_2\mathcal{B}_2 + \ldots + \beta_J\mathcal{B}_J$$

with stoichiometric coefficients $\alpha_i, \beta_j \geq 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, I$ and $j = 1, \ldots, J$ for any $I, J \geq 1$. For the sake of convenience and w.l.o.g. we rescale the forward and backward reaction rate constants to $k_f = k_b = 1$. An explicit entropy entropy-dissipation estimate was left open in [MHM15] whenever $I + J \geq 3$.

The reaction is assumed to take place in reaction vessel, i.e. in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n, n \geq 1$ with sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ (e.g. $\partial\Omega \in C^{2+\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$). The mass action reaction-diffusion system reads as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t a_i - \operatorname{div}(d_{a,i}\nabla a_i) = -\alpha_i(\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, I, \\ \partial_t b_j - \operatorname{div}(d_{b,j}\nabla b_j) = -\beta_j(\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, J, \\ \nabla a_i \cdot \nu = \nabla b_j \cdot \nu = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}_+, \quad i = 1, \ldots, I,\ j = 1, \ldots, J, \\ a(x,0) = a_0(x), \quad b(x,0) = b_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where $d_{a,i}, d_{b,j}$ are diffusion coefficients satisfying

$$0 < d_{min} \leq d_{a,i},\, d_{b,j} \leq d_{max} < +\infty \qquad \forall i = 1, \ldots, I,\ j = 1, \ldots, J,$$

$\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_I)$, $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_J)$ are the vectors of left- and right-hand-side concentrations, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_I) \in [1, +\infty)^I$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_J) \in [1, +\infty)^J$ are the corresponding vectors of stoichiometric coefficients and we recall the notation

$$\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \prod_{i=1}^{I} a_i^{\alpha_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \prod_{j=1}^{J} b_j^{\beta_j}.$$

The aim of this section is to apply the method proposed in Section 2 to prove the entropy entropy-dissipation estimate (1.17), which implies explicit convergence to equilibrium for the system (3.1). First, we shall specify the mass conservation laws for (3.1), which are essential to our strategy. Then, (3.1) is shown to satisfy the assumptions (**A1**) and (**A2**), that is (3.1) satisfies the detailed balance condition and has no boundary equilibrium. Finally, we prove the main result of this section Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 3.1 (Mass conservation laws)**.**
The system (3.1) obeys $I + J - 1$ linear independent mass conservation laws. With respect to the general notation of conservation laws (1.3), the matrix $\mathbb{Q}$ can be chosen as

$$\mathbb{Q} = [v_1, \ldots, v_J, w_2, \ldots, w_I]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(I+J-1)\times(I+J)}$$

where the zero left-eigenvectors v_j and w_i are defined by

$$v_j = \Big(\underbrace{\frac{1}{\alpha_1}, 0, \ldots, 0, \frac{1}{\beta_j}}_{I+j}, 0, \ldots, 0\Big) \qquad \text{and} \qquad w_i = \Big(\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0, \frac{1}{\alpha_i}}_{i}, 0, \ldots, 0, \underbrace{\frac{1}{\beta_1}}_{I+1}, 0, \ldots, 0\Big), \tag{3.2}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq J$ and $2 \leq i \leq I$.

Proof. From (3.1), by dividing the equation of a_i by α_i and the equation of b_j by β_j, summation and integration over Ω yields, thanks to the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{a_i(x,t)}{\alpha_i} + \frac{b_j(x,t)}{\beta_j}\right) dx = 0 \qquad \forall t > 0.$$

Hence, after introducing the nonnegative partial masses $M_{i,j} := \int_\Omega \big(\frac{a_{i,0}(x)}{\alpha_i} + \frac{b_{j,0}(x)}{\beta_j}\big)dx$, we observe that system (3.1) obeys the following IJ mass conservation laws

$$\frac{\overline{a_i}(t)}{\alpha_i} + \frac{\overline{b_j}(t)}{\beta_j} = M_{i,j}, \qquad \forall t > 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, I, \quad \forall j = 1, \ldots, J, \tag{3.3}$$

where we recall the notation $\overline{a_i} = \int_\Omega a_i(x)dx$. The following $I + J - 1$ conservations laws

$$\frac{\overline{a_1}}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\overline{b_j}}{\beta_j} = M_{1,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\overline{a_i}}{\alpha_i} + \frac{\overline{b_1}}{\beta_1} = M_{i,1} \qquad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \ldots, J, \quad i = 2, \ldots, I.$$

are linear independent since the corresponding zero left-eigenvectors v_j and w_i as given in (3.2) are linear independent by construction. Moreover, all other conservation laws can be expressed in terms of these $I+J-1$ conservation laws due to

$$\frac{\overline{a_i}}{\alpha_i}+\frac{\overline{b_j}}{\beta_j}=\left(M_{i,1}-\frac{\overline{b_1}}{\beta_1}\right)+\left(M_{1,j}-\frac{\overline{a_1}}{\alpha_1}\right)=M_{i,1}+M_{1,j}-M_{1,1}.$$

■

Remark 3.1. *It follows from the Lemma 3.1 that the $I+J-1$ coordinates of the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$ are determined by prescribing $M_{1,j}$ for $1\le j\le J$ and $M_{i,1}$ for $i=2,\dots,I$. Therefore, by calling the initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$ fixed, we mean that those coordinates are prescribed.*

Remark 3.2. *Another useful set of conservation laws follows from dividing the equation for a_i by α_i and the equation for a_k by α_k for $1\le i\ne k\le I$:*

$$\int_\Omega\left(\frac{a_i(t,x)}{\alpha_i}-\frac{a_k(t,x)}{\alpha_k}\right)dx=N_{i,k}:=\int_\Omega\left(\frac{a_{i,0}(x)}{\alpha_i}-\frac{a_{k,0}(x)}{\alpha_k}\right)dx,\qquad\forall t\ge0,\quad 1\le i\ne k\le I,$$

It's also useful to observe that

$$N_{i,k}=M_{i,j}-M_{k,j},\qquad\forall 1\le j\le J. \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.2 (Unique constant positive detailed balance equilibrium)**.**
For any fixed positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M}$, the system (3.1) possesses a unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty,\boldsymbol{b}_\infty)\in(0,+\infty)^{I+J}$ solving

$$\begin{cases}\dfrac{a_{i,\infty}}{\alpha_i}+\dfrac{b_{j,\infty}}{\beta_j}=M_{i,j}, & i=1,\dots,I,\quad j=1,\dots,J,\\ \boldsymbol{a}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}=\boldsymbol{b}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}.\end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

*Consequently, system (3.1) satisfies the assumptions (**A1**) and (**A2**).*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\frac{a_{1,\infty}}{\alpha_1}=\min_{i=1,2,\dots,I}\left\{\frac{a_{i,\infty}}{\alpha_i}\right\}.$$

Then, from (3.5) and (3.4), we have for all $i>1$

$$\frac{a_{i,\infty}}{\alpha_i}-\frac{a_{1,\infty}}{\alpha_1}=M_{i,k}-M_{1,k}=N_{i,1} \tag{3.6}$$

and thus

$$\prod_{i=1}^I a_{i,\infty}^{\alpha_i}=a_{1,\infty}^{\alpha_1}\prod_{i=2}^I\left(\alpha_iN_{i,1}+\frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_1}a_{1,\infty}\right)^{\alpha_i}=:f(a_{1,\infty}),$$

which is a strictly monotone increasing function in $a_{1,\infty}$. From (3.5), we deduce similarly that $b_{j,\infty}=\beta_jM_{1,j}-\frac{\beta_j}{\alpha_1}a_{1,\infty}\ge0$ and thus

$$\prod_{j=1}^J b_{j,\infty}^{\beta_j}=\prod_{j=1}^J\left(\beta_jM_{1,j}-\frac{\beta_j}{\alpha_1}a_{1,\infty}\right)^{\beta_j}=:g(a_{1,\infty}),$$

which is a strictly monotone decreasing function in $a_{1,\infty}$.

From the definition, it is obvious that $f(0)=0$ and $g(0)>0$ since $\mathbf{M}>0$. On the other hand, we have $a_{1,\infty}\le\min_{j=1,\dots,J}\{\alpha_1M_{1,j}\}=:a_{1,max}$ and consequently $f(a_{1,max})>0$ and $g(a_{1,max})=0$. Thus the equation $f(a_{1,\infty})=g(a_{1,\infty})$ has a unique positive solution $a_{1,\infty}\in(0,a_{1,max})$. Hence, there exists a unique positive equilibrium $(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty,\boldsymbol{b}_\infty)$.

It is straightforward that the assumption (**A1**) holds. The assumption (**A2**) can be easily verified by assuming $a_{i_0,\infty}=0$ for some $1\le i_0\le I$, which implies $\boldsymbol{a}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}=0$. Then, by (3.5), $b_{j,\infty}=M_{i_0,j}>0$ for $j=1,2,\dots,J$, and thus $\boldsymbol{b}_\infty^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}>0$, which is a contradiction. We conclude $a_{i,\infty}>0$ for all $i=1,2,\dots,I$ and similarly, $b_{j,\infty}>0$ for all $j=1,2,\dots,J$. Therefore, the system (3.1) has no boundary equilibrium. ■

The entropy functional for system (3.1) writes as

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})=\sum_{i=1}^I\int_\Omega(a_i\log a_i-a_i+1)dx+\sum_{j=1}^J\int_\Omega(b_j\log b_j-b_j+1)dx$$

and the entropy-dissipation writes as

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{I}\int_\Omega d_{a,i}\frac{|\nabla a_i|^2}{a_i}dx + \sum_{j=1}^{J}\int_\Omega d_{b,j}\frac{|\nabla b_j|^2}{b_j}dx + \int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\log\frac{\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}{\boldsymbol{b}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}dx.$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mu_i \in [-1,+\infty)$, $i=1,\dots,I$ and $\xi_j \in [-1,+\infty)$, $j=1,\dots,J$ satisfy*

$$A_{i,\infty}^2\,\mu_i(\mu_i+2) + B_{j,\infty}^2\,\xi_j(\xi_j+2) = 0, \qquad \text{for all} \quad 1\le i\le I, \quad 1\le j\le J. \tag{3.7}$$

Then, the following inequality holds

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{I}(1+\mu_i)^{\alpha_i} - \prod_{j=1}^{J}(1+\xi_j)^{\beta_j}\right)^2 \ge H_4^{single}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{I}\mu_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{J}\xi_j^2\right) \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$H_4^{single} = \frac{1}{\max\{I,J\}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Remark 3.3. *Note that μ_i and ξ_j are introduced analog to (2.28), i.e.*

$$\overline{A_i^2} = A_{i,\infty}^2(1+\mu_i)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{B_j^2} = B_{j,\infty}^2(1+\xi_j)^2.$$

Proof. The proof of (3.8) relies only on sign relations between μ_i and ξ_j entailed by the conservation laws (3.7). Since $\mu_i,\xi_j\in[-1,+\infty)$, it follows from (3.7) that μ_i and ξ_j must have opposite signs. In particular, if $\mu_i\ge 0$ for some $i=1,2,\dots,I$, then $\xi_j\le 0$ for all $j=1,2,\dots,J$ and in return $\mu_i\ge 0$ for all $i=1,2,\dots,I$. Therefore, we only have to consider two cases:

(I) $\mu_i\ge 0$ and $\xi_j\le 0$ for all $i=1,2,\dots,I$ and $j=1,2,\dots,J$, or
(II) $\mu_i\le 0$ and $\xi_j\ge 0$ for all $i=1,2,\dots,I$ and $j=1,2,\dots,J$.

We will only prove case (I) since case (II) can be treated analogue. Now since $\mu_i\ge 0$ and $-1\le\xi_j\le 0$, we can apply Jensen inequality for any $1\le i_*\le I$ and $1\le j_*\le J$ to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\prod_{i=1}^{I}(1+\mu_i)^{\alpha_i} - \prod_{j=1}^{J}(1+\xi_j)^{\beta_j}\right| &\ge \prod_{i=1}^{I}(1+\mu_i)^{\alpha_i} - \prod_{j=1}^{J}(1+\xi_j)^{\beta_j} \ge \prod_{i=1}^{I}(1+\mu_i) - \prod_{j=1}^{J}(1+\xi_j)\\ &\ge (1+\mu_{i_*}) - (1+\xi_{j_*})\\ &= \mu_{i_*} - \xi_{j_*} \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any indices $1\le i_*\le I$ and $1\le j_*\le J$

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{I}(1+\mu_i)^{\alpha_i} - \prod_{j=1}^{J}(1+\xi_j)^{\beta_j}\right)^2 \ge (\mu_{i_*}-\xi_{j_*})^2 \ge \mu_{i_*}^2 + \xi_{j_*}^2$$

since $\mu_{i^*}\mu_{j^*}\le 0$, and (3.8) follows immediately. ∎

Lemma 3.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, there exists $0<\varepsilon\ll 1$ such that if $\overline{A_i^2}\le\varepsilon^2$ for some $i=1,\dots,I$ or $\overline{B_j^2}\le\varepsilon^2$ for some $j=1,\dots,J$, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I}\|\nabla A_i\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{J}\|\nabla B_j\|^2 + \left(\overline{\boldsymbol{A}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \overline{\boldsymbol{B}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)^2 \ge H_5^{single} \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$H_5^{single} = \min\left\{\frac{C_p\varepsilon^2}{\max_i\alpha_i}; \frac{C_p\varepsilon^2}{\max_j\beta_j}; \frac{1}{4}\min_i\prod_{j=1}^{J}\left[\frac{\beta_j M_{i,j}}{2}\right]^{\beta_j}; \min_j\prod_{i=1}^{I}\left[\frac{\alpha_i M_{i,j}}{2}\right]^{\alpha_i}\right\}. \tag{3.11}$$

Remark 3.4. *The value of ε can be computed explicitly, see (3.15).*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\overline{A_{i_0}^2}\le\varepsilon^2$ for some $1\le i_0\le I$. Define

$$\delta_i(x) = A_i(x) - \overline{A}_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad \eta_j(x) = B_j(x) - \overline{B}_j$$

for $i=1,\dots,I$ and $j=1,\dots,J$. We will to consider two subcases due to the amount of diffusion represented by the values of $\|\delta_i\|^2$ and $\|\eta_j\|^2$:

(i) (Diffusion is dominant.) Consider that $\|\delta_{i_*}\|^2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\alpha_{i_0}}$ for some $1 \leq i_* \leq I$ or $\|\eta_{j_*}\|^2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\alpha_{i_0}}$ for some $1 \leq j_* \leq J$. Then, thanks to the Poincaré inequality, the left hand side of (3.10) obviously bounded below by

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla A_i\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla B_j\|^2 + \left(\overline{\boldsymbol{A}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} - \overline{\boldsymbol{B}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}\right)^2 \geq C_P\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \|\delta_i\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^J \|\eta_j\|^2\right) \geq \frac{C_P\varepsilon^2}{\alpha_{i_0}} \geq \frac{C_p\varepsilon^2}{\max_i \alpha_i}. \quad (3.12)$$

(ii) (Reactions are dominant.) Consider that $\|\delta_i\|^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\alpha_{i_0}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, I$ and $\|\eta_j\|^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\alpha_{i_0}}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, J$. Then, by using the mass conservation (3.3),

$$\frac{\overline{A_{i_0}^2}}{\alpha_{i_0}} + \frac{\overline{B_j^2}}{\beta_j} = M_{i_0,j},$$

we have with $\overline{A_{i_0}^2} \leq \varepsilon^2$

$$\overline{B_j^2} = \beta_j\left(M_{i_0,j} - \frac{\overline{A_{i_0}^2}}{\alpha_{i_0}}\right) \geq \beta_j\left(M_{i_0,j} - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\alpha_{i_0}}\right),$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, J$. Hence, for all $j = 1, \dots, J$,

$$\overline{B_j}^2 = \overline{B_j^2} - \|\eta_j\|^2 \geq \beta_j M_{i_0,j} - \frac{\beta_j + 1}{\alpha_{i_0}}\varepsilon^2.$$

Then, we estimate the left hand side of (3.10) with an elementary inequality $(a-b)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}a^2 - b^2$, $\overline{A_{i_0}^2} \leq \varepsilon^2$ and $\overline{A_i}^{2\alpha_i} \leq \overline{A_i^2}^{\alpha_i} \leq (\alpha_i M_{i,1})^{\alpha_i}$ for all $i \neq i_0$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\prod_{i=1}^I \overline{A_i}^{\alpha_i} - \prod_{j=1}^J \overline{B_j}^{\beta_j}\right)^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2}\prod_{j=1}^J \overline{B_j}^{2\beta_j} - \prod_{i=1}^I \overline{A_i}^{2\alpha_i} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\prod_{j=1}^J \left[\beta_j M_{i_0,j} - \frac{\beta_j+1}{\alpha_{i_0}}\varepsilon^2\right]^{\beta_j} - \varepsilon^2 \prod_{i=1, i\neq i_0}^I (\alpha_i M_{i,1})^{\alpha_i}.\end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

We now choose ε small enough such that both inequalities

$$\beta_j M_{i_0,j} - \frac{\beta_j+1}{\alpha_{i_0}}\varepsilon^2 \geq \frac{\beta_j M_{i_0,j}}{2} \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, \dots, J$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}\prod_{j=1}^J \left[\frac{\beta_j M_{i_0,j}}{2}\right]^{\beta_j} - \varepsilon^2 \prod_{i=1, i\neq i_0}^I (\alpha_i M_{i,1})^{\alpha_i} \geq \frac{1}{4}\prod_{j=1}^J \left[\frac{\beta_j M_{i_0,j}}{2}\right]^{\beta_j} \geq \frac{1}{4}\min_i \prod_{j=1}^J \left[\frac{\beta_j M_{i,j}}{2}\right]^{\beta_j} \quad (3.14)$$

hold, e.g. ε fulfills

$$\varepsilon^2 \leq \min\left\{\min_{1\leq j\leq J}\left\{\frac{\alpha_{i_0}\beta_j M_{i_0,j}}{4(\beta_j+1)}\right\}; \frac{1}{4}\left(\prod_{i=1, i\neq i_0}^I (\alpha_i M_{i,1})^{\alpha_i}\right)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^J \left[\frac{\beta_j M_{i_0,j}}{2}\right]^{\beta_j}\right\}. \quad (3.15)$$

It then follows from (3.13) and (3.14) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \|\nabla A_i\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla B_j\|^2 + \left(\overline{\boldsymbol{A}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} - \overline{\boldsymbol{B}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}\right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}\min_i \prod_{j=1}^J \left[\frac{\beta_j M_{i,j}}{2}\right]^{\beta_j} \quad (3.16)$$

Combining (3.12) and (3.16) we obtain the desired inequality (3.10).

■

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that the assumptions (**A1**) and (**A2**) hold for system (1.13).

From Theorem 1.4 for general systems and the two Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we obtain the desired entropy entropy-dissipation estimate (1.17) for an explicit constant $\lambda_1 > 0$.

The existence of a global (in time) renormalised solution $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$ follows from [Fis15]. Assume now that a renormalised solution $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$ satisfies the weak entropy entropy-dissipation law (1.10), then thanks to the inequality (1.17) and a suitable Gronwall argument, see e.g. [Wil] or more specifically [FL16], we obtain the convergence to equilibrium in relative entropy

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}(t), \boldsymbol{b}(t)) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty, \boldsymbol{b}_\infty) \leq e^{-\lambda_1 t}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \boldsymbol{b}_0) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{a}_\infty, \boldsymbol{b}_\infty)).$$

Finally, L^1-convergence to equilibrium of renormalised solutions follows from the Ciszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequality in Lemma 2.2. ∎

4. Reversible enzyme reactions - Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section, we demonstrate the strategy in Section 2 for a chain of two reversible reactions modelling, for instance, reversible enzyme reactions. More precisely, we consider the system

$$\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \leftrightharpoons \mathcal{C}_3 \leftrightharpoons \mathcal{C}_4 + \mathcal{C}_5. \tag{4.1}$$

In [BCD07] and [BP10], this reaction was studied in the context of performing a quasi-steady-state-approximation, i.e. that the releasing reaction rate constant from $\mathcal{C}_3$ to $\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2$ and from $\mathcal{C}_3$ to $\mathcal{C}_4 + \mathcal{C}_5$ are taken to diverge to infinitely. Here in contrast, we shall assume all the reaction constants to be one.

As in the previous section, we assume the reaction to occur on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and normalised volume $|\Omega| = 1$. By applying the mass action law, the corresponding reaction-diffusion system of (4.1) reads as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t c_1 - \operatorname{div}(d_1 \nabla c_1) = -c_1 c_2 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t c_2 - \operatorname{div}(d_2 \nabla c_2) = -c_1 c_2 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t c_3 - \operatorname{div}(d_3 \nabla c_3) = c_1 c_2 + c_4 c_5 - 2c_3, & \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t c_4 - \operatorname{div}(d_4 \nabla c_4) = -c_4 c_5 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t c_5 - \operatorname{div}(d_5 \nabla c_5) = -c_4 c_5 + c_3, & \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \nabla c_i \cdot \nu = 0, \qquad i = 1, 2, \dots, 5, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ c_i(x, 0) = c_{i,0}(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

where $d_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ are positive diffusion coefficients.

This section is organised as follows: We first derive the mass conservation laws for (4.2), which play an essential role in our method. Then, we show that (4.2) satisfies the assumptions (**A1**) and (**A2**). Finally, we apply the method presented in Section 2 to prove explicit convergence to equilibrium for (4.2). For the sake of convenience, we will denote by $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5)$. We begin by stating the mass conservation laws. The proof of the following Lemma 4.1 is straightforward and thus omitted.

Lemma 4.1 (Conservation laws for (4.2))**.**
For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{4, 5\}$, we have (after recalling the notation $\overline{c_i}(t) = \int_\Omega c_i(x, t)dx$)

$$\overline{c_i}(t) + \overline{c_j}(t) + \overline{c_3}(t) = \overline{c_{i,0}} + \overline{c_{j,0}} + \overline{c_{3,0}} =: M_{i,j}, \qquad \text{for all} \quad t > 0.$$

Among these four conservation laws, there are exactly three linear independent conservation laws. Moreover, in terms of the notations (1.1) and (1.3), the matrix $\mathbb{Q}$ can be chosen as

$$\mathbb{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 5}.$$

Remark 4.1. *We denote by $(M_{1,4}, M_{1,5}, M_{2,4}, M_{2,5}) \in \mathbb{R}^4_+$ the vector of conserved masses. Note that the positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$ is given once three linear independent coordinates of $(M_{1,4}, M_{1,5}, M_{2,4}, M_{2,5}) \in \mathbb{R}^4_+$ are prescribed.*

Lemma 4.2 (Detailed balance equilibrium)**.**
For any given positive initial mass vector $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$, there exists a unique positive detailed balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = (c_{1,\infty}, c_{2,\infty}, \dots, c_{5,\infty})$ to (4.2) satisfying

$$\begin{cases} c_{1,\infty} c_{2,\infty} = c_{3,\infty}, \\ c_{4,\infty} c_{5,\infty} = c_{3,\infty}, \\ c_{i,\infty} + c_{j,\infty} + c_{3,\infty} = M_{i,j}, \qquad \forall i \in \{1, 2\}, \quad \forall j \in \{4, 5\}. \end{cases}$$

*Consequently, the system (4.2) satisfies the assumptions (**A1**) and (**A2**).*

Proof. The proof of this Lemma follows from similar calculations as the proof of Lemma 3.2 and is omitted. ∎

To prove the convergence to the equilibrium for (4.2), we consider the entropy functional

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \int_\Omega (c_i \log c_i - c_i + 1) dx$$

and its entropy-dissipation

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}) = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \int_\Omega d_i \frac{|\nabla c_i|^2}{c_i} dx + \int_\Omega \left((c_1 c_2 - c_3) \log \frac{c_1 c_2}{a_3} + (c_4 c_5 - c_3) \log \frac{c_4 c_5}{c_3} \right) dx.$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_5 \in [-1, +\infty)$ satisfy the following conservation laws*

$$C_{1,\infty}^2 \mu_1(\mu_1+2) + C_{3,\infty}^2 \mu_3(\mu_3+2) + C_{4,\infty}^2 \mu_4(\mu_4+2) = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

$$C_{1,\infty}^2 \mu_1(\mu_1+2) + C_{3,\infty}^2 \mu_3(\mu_3+2) + C_{5,\infty}^2 \mu_5(\mu_5+2) = 0, \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$C_{2,\infty}^2 \mu_2(\mu_2+2) + C_{3,\infty}^2 \mu_3(\mu_3+2) + C_{4,\infty}^2 \mu_4(\mu_4+2) = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

These conservation laws correspond to those of Lemma 4.1 (recalling the perturbation argument (2.28), i.e. $\overline{C_i^2} = C_{i,\infty}^2 (1+\mu_i)^2$ for $i = 1, \dots, 5$).

Then, there holds

$$\big((1+\mu_1)(1+\mu_2) - (1+\mu_3)\big)^2 + \big((1+\mu_4)(1+\mu_5) - (1+\mu_3)\big)^2 \geq \frac{1}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \mu_i^2. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. This inequality is similar to (3.8). However, due to the different structure of mass conservation laws, we need to use a different proof.

By the triangle inequality, the left hand side of (4.6) is bounded below by

$$\begin{aligned} &\big((1+\mu_1)(1+\mu_2) - (1+\mu_3)\big)^2 + \big((1+\mu_4)(1+\mu_5) - (1+\mu_3)\big)^2 \\ &\qquad \geq \frac{1}{4} \Big[\underbrace{\big((1+\mu_1)(1+\mu_2) - (1+\mu_3)\big)^2}_{=:G_1} + \underbrace{\big((1+\mu_4)(1+\mu_5) - (1+\mu_3)\big)^2}_{=:G_2} \\ &\qquad\qquad + \underbrace{\big((1+\mu_1)(1+\mu_2) - (1+\mu_4)(1+\mu_5)\big)^2}_{=:G_3} \Big] \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

From the conservation laws (4.3) and (4.5) we have

$$C_{1,\infty}^2 \, \mu_1(\mu_1+2) = C_{2,\infty}^2 \, \mu_2(\mu_2+2).$$

Moreover, since $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in [-1, +\infty)$, it follows that μ_1 and μ_2 have always a same sign. Similarly, μ_4 and μ_5 have always a same sign. We have the following useful estimates

- If μ_1 and μ_3 have different signs, then

$$G_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2 + \mu_3^2). \tag{G1}$$

  Indeed, thanks to $\mu_1\mu_3 \leq 0 \leq \mu_1\mu_2$ and $(1+\mu_1) \geq 0$, we have $(\mu_1 - \mu_3)\mu_2(1+\mu_1) \geq 0$. Hence

$$G_1 = [\mu_1 - \mu_3 + \mu_2(1+\mu_1)]^2 \geq (\mu_1 - \mu_3)^2 \geq \mu_1^2 + \mu_3^2.$$

  Similarly we get $G_1 \geq \mu_2^2 + \mu_3^2$ and consequently that the estimate (G1) holds.

- If μ_4 and μ_3 have different signs then

$$G_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\mu_4^2 + \mu_5^2 + \mu_3^2). \tag{G2}$$

  This can be proved in the same way as (G1).

- If μ_1 and μ_4 have different signs then

$$G_3 \geq \frac{1}{3}(\mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2 + \mu_4^2 + \mu_5^2). \tag{G3}$$

  Note that in this case $\mu_1\mu_4 \leq 0 \leq \mu_1\mu_2, \mu_4\mu_5$ and $(1+\mu_1), (1+\mu_4) \geq 0$ and we have always

$$(\mu_1 - \mu_4)\mu_2(1+\mu_1) \geq 0, \quad -(\mu_1 - \mu_4)\mu_5(1+\mu_4) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad -\mu_2\mu_5(1+\mu_1)(1+\mu_4) \geq 0.$$

  Therefore,

$$G_3 = [\mu_1 - \mu_4 + \mu_2(1+\mu_1) - \mu_5(1+\mu_4)]^2 \geq (\mu_1 - \mu_4)^2 \geq \mu_1^2 + \mu_4^2.$$

Similarly we have $G_3 \geq \mu_1^2 + \mu_5^2$ and $G_3 \geq \mu_2^2 + \mu_4^2$ and consequently that (G3) holds.

From the conservation law (4.3) the following possibilities concerning the signs of μ_1, μ_3 and μ_4.

Case	μ_1	μ_3	μ_4
(I)	-	-	+
(II)	-	+	-
(III)	-	+	+
(IV)	+	-	-
(V)	+	-	+
(VI)	+	+	-

We see that in all these cases, there are always two of the three estimates (G1), (G2) and (G3) that hold. Therefore, thanks to (4.7), we obtain the desired estimate (4.6). ∎

Lemma 4.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, there exists $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ such that, if $\overline{C_i^2} \leq \varepsilon^2$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, 5$, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{5} \|\nabla C_i\|^2 + (\overline{C}_1\overline{C}_2 - \overline{C}_3)^2 + (\overline{C}_4\overline{C}_5 - \overline{C}_3)^2 \geq H_5^{chain} \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$H_5^{chain} = \min\left\{ \frac{C_P\varepsilon^2}{2}; \frac{M_{1,5}}{32}; \frac{M_{1,4}M_{1,5}}{512}; \frac{M_{2,5}^2}{256} \right\}. \tag{4.9}$$

Remark 4.2. *We can compute ε explicitly, for example*

$$\varepsilon^2 \leq \min\left\{ \frac{M_{1,4}}{4}; \frac{M_{1,5}}{4}; \frac{M_{2,5}}{4}; \frac{M_{1,5}}{32M_{2,4}}; \frac{M_{1,4}M_{1,5}}{256M_{2,4}}; \frac{M_{2,5}^2}{256} \right\}. \tag{4.10}$$

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Define the deviations

$$\delta_i(x) = C_i(x) - \overline{C}_i \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad i = 1, \ldots, 5.$$

We again consider two cases due to various contributions of diffusion and reaction terms.

(i) (Diffusion is dominant.) If $\|\delta_{i_*}\|^2 \geq \varepsilon^2/2$ for some $i_* \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 5\}$, then we can estimate

$$\text{LHS of (4.8)} \geq C_P \sum_{i=1}^{5} \|\delta_i\|^2 \geq \frac{C_P\,\varepsilon^2}{2}. \tag{4.11}$$

(ii) (Reactions are dominant.) Consider $\|\delta_i\|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2/2$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 5$. We recall $\overline{C_{i_0}^2} \leq \varepsilon^2$ for some $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 5\}$ and remark that the roles of C_1, C_2, C_4 and C_5 in (4.8) are the same. Therefore, without loss of generality, it is sufficient to investigate the two cases: $i_0 = 1$ and $i_0 = 3$:

- When $i_0 = 1$ then from the mass conservation

$$\overline{C_1^2} + \overline{C_4^2} + \overline{C_3^2} = M_{1,4} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{C_1^2} + \overline{C_5^2} + \overline{C_3^2} = M_{1,5},$$

we get

$$\overline{C_3^2} + \overline{C_4^2} \geq M_{1,4} - \varepsilon^2 \geq \frac{M_{1,4}}{2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{C_3^2} + \overline{C_5^2} \geq M_{1,5} - \varepsilon^2 \geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{2}. \tag{4.12}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $M_{1,4} \geq M_{1,5}$. From (4.12) we have the following three possibilities

Case	$\overline{C_3^2}$	$\overline{C_4^2}$	$\overline{C_5^2}$
(I)	$\overline{C_3^2} \geq \frac{M_{1,4}}{4}$	$\leq \frac{M_{1,4}}{4}$	$\leq \frac{M_{1,5}}{4}$
(II)	$\overline{C_3^2} \leq \frac{M_{1,5}}{4}$	$\geq \frac{M_{1,4}}{4}$	$\geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{4}$
(III)	$\frac{M_{1,5}}{4} \leq \overline{C_3^2} \leq \frac{M_{1,4}}{4}$	$\geq \frac{M_{1,4}}{4}$	$\leq \frac{M_{1,5}}{4}$

In cases (I) and (III), we both have $\overline{C_3^2} \geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{4}$ and, thus

$$\overline{C}_3^2 = \overline{C_3^2} - \|\delta_3\|^2 \geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{8}.$$

Hence the left hand side of (4.8) is estimated as

$$\text{LHS of (4.8)} \geq (\overline{C}_1\overline{C}_2 - \overline{C}_3)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\overline{C}_3^2 - \overline{C}_1^2\overline{C}_2^2 \geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{16} - \varepsilon^2 M_{2,4} \geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{32} \tag{4.13}$$

thanks to (4.10).
In case (II), we have

$$\overline{C}_4^2 = \overline{C_4^2} - \|\delta_4\|^2 \geq \frac{M_{1,4}}{8} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{C}_5^2 = \overline{C_5^2} - \|\delta_5\|^2 \geq \frac{M_{1,5}}{8}.$$

We continue with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (4.8)} &\geq (\overline{C}_1\overline{C}_2 - \overline{C}_3)^2 + (\overline{C}_4\overline{C}_5 - \overline{C}_3)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\overline{C}_4\overline{C}_5 - \overline{C}_1\overline{C}_2)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\overline{C}_4^2\overline{C}_5^2 - \frac{1}{2}\overline{C}_1^2\overline{C}_2^2 \geq \frac{M_{1,4}M_{1,5}}{256} - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 M_{2,4} \geq \frac{M_{1,4}M_{1,5}}{512} \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

thanks again to (4.10). Combining (4.13) and (4.14), we have

$$\text{LHS of (4.8)} \geq \min\left\{\frac{M_{1,5}}{32}; \frac{M_{1,4}M_{1,5}}{512}\right\} \tag{4.15}$$

which ends the proof in the case $i_0 = 1$.

- When $i_0 = 3$, we obtain first that $\overline{C}_3^2 \leq \overline{C_3^2} \leq \varepsilon^2$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $M_{1,4}$ is the biggest component of $\mathbf{M}$. Thus,

$$\overline{C_1^2} = \overline{C_2^2} + M_{1,4} - M_{2,4} \geq \overline{C_2^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{C_4^2} = \overline{C_5^2} + M_{1,4} - M_{1,5} \geq \overline{C_5^2}.$$

By using the mass conservation $\overline{C_2^2} + \overline{C_3^2} + \overline{C_5^2} = M_{2,5}$, we get

$$\overline{C_2^2} + \overline{C_5^2} \geq M_{2,5} - \varepsilon^2 \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{2},$$

hence

$$\overline{C_2^2} \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{4} \quad \text{or} \quad \overline{C_5^2} \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{4}.$$

If $\overline{C_2^2} \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{4}$ then $\overline{C_1^2} \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{4}$. It follows that

$$\overline{C}_1^2 = \overline{C_1^2} - \|\delta_1\|^2 \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{8} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{C}_2^2 = \overline{C_2^2} - \|\delta_2\|^2 \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{8}.$$

We can then estimate due to (4.10)

$$\text{LHS of (4.8)} \geq (\overline{C}_1\overline{C}_2 - \overline{C}_3)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\overline{C}_1^2\overline{C}_2^2 - \overline{C}_3^2 \geq \frac{M_{2,5}^2}{128} - \varepsilon^2 \geq \frac{M_{2,5}^2}{256}. \tag{4.16}$$

Similarly, if $\overline{C_5^2} \geq \frac{M_{2,5}}{8}$, we can prove by using the same arguments above that

$$\text{LHS of (4.8)} \geq \frac{M_{2,5}^2}{256}, \tag{4.17}$$

which ends the case $i_0 = 3$.

From (4.11), (4.15), (4.16) and (4.17), we obtain the desired estimate (4.8).

■

Proof of Theorem 1.3. First of all, the validity of assumptions (**A1**) and (**A2**) for system (1.18) follows from Lemma 4.2.

Then, the entropy entropy-dissipation estimate (1.23) follows for a constant λ_2 from Theorem 1.4, Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4. From (1.18), we have

$$\partial_t(c_1 + c_3 + c_4) - \Delta(d_1c_1 + d_3c_3 + d_4c_4) = 0$$

and

$$\partial_t(c_2 + c_3 + c_5) - \Delta(d_2c_2 + d_3c_3 + d_5c_5) = 0.$$

Then, it follows from an improved duality estimate (see [CDF14, Lemma 3.2], which holds in fact in all space dimensions) that for some $p > 2$ (sufficiently close to 2)

$$\|c_i\|_{L^p(0,T;L^p(\Omega))} \leq C(T) \quad \text{for all } T > 0$$

where $C(T)$ is a constant, which grows at most polynomially in T. Since all the nonlinearities in (1.18) are quadratic, we can apply results from e.g. [Pie10, DFPV07] to ensure that there exists a global weak solution $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_5) \in L^p(0,T;L^p(\Omega))^5$ for all $T > 0$. Moreover, similarly to [DFPV07] each weak solution satisfies the weak entropy entropy-dissipation law

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}(t)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}(s))ds = \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) \quad t > 0.$$

Hence, by applying the entropy entropy-dissipation inequality (1.23) to the above entropy entropy-dissipation law, a Gronwall argument yields exponential convergence to equilibrium in relative entropy

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}(t)) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \leq e^{-\lambda_2 t}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))$$

and finally, by using the Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequality in Lemma 2.2, we obtain exponential L^1-convergence of weak solutions to equilibrium

$$\sum_{i=1}^5 \|c_i(t) - c_{i,\infty}\|^2_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_{CKP}^{-1}(\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_0) - \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty))e^{-\lambda_2 t} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

■

5. Summary, further applications and open problems

In this paper, we exploit the entropy method to show explicit convergence to equilibrium for detailed balance chemical reaction-diffusion networks describing substances in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ according to the mass action law. More precisely, in Section 2.2 we propose a constructive method to prove an entropy entropy-dissipation estimate with computable rates and constants. The corresponding If-Theorem (1.4) relies on two assumed functional inequalities (1.24) and (1.25), where the first one is a finite dimensional inequality and quantifies the uniqueness of the detailed balance equilibrium. The second inequality is a lower bound for the entropy dissipation when the concentration vector is close to the boundary $\partial\mathbb{R}^I_+$. These estimates suggest a general method for any general system of the form (1.1)–(1.2), once the mass conservation laws are explicitly known. The applicability of the general method is demonstrated in Sections 3 and 4 for two specific types of reaction-diffusion networks: A single reversible reaction (3.1) and a chain of reversible reactions (4.2), which is motivated by enzyme reactions.

5.1. **Further applications.** We point out that the proposed approach applies also to reaction-diffusion networks where the chemical substances are supported on different spatial compartments. For example in [FLT], the reversible reaction

$$\alpha\,\mathcal{U} \leftrightharpoons \beta\,\mathcal{V}$$

is considered between a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and its smooth boundary $\Gamma := \partial\Omega$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is the volume-substance inside Ω and $\mathcal{V}$ is the surface-substance on Γ and the reaction is assumed to happen on Γ. The corresponding volume-surface reaction-diffusion system reads as

$$\begin{cases} u_t - d_u\Delta u = 0, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ d_u\partial_\nu u = -\alpha(u^\alpha - v^\beta), & x \in \Gamma, \quad t > 0, \\ v_t - d_v\Delta_\Gamma v = \beta(u^\alpha - v^\beta), & x \in \Gamma, \quad t > 0, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), \quad v(0,x) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

in which $u : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the volume-concentration of $\mathcal{U}$ and $v : \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the surface-concentration of $\mathcal{V}$, and Δ_Γ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator which describes diffusion of $\mathcal{V}$ along Γ. The system (5.1) possesses the mass conservation law

$$\beta \int_\Omega u(x,t)dx + \alpha \int_\Gamma v(x,t)dS = \beta \int_\Omega u_0(x)dx + \alpha \int_\Gamma v_0(x)dS =: M > 0, \qquad \forall\, t \geq 0$$

and thus obeys a unique positive equilibrium (u_∞, v_∞) satisfying

$$\begin{cases} u_\infty^\alpha = v_\infty^\beta, \\ \beta|\Omega|u_\infty + \alpha|\Gamma|v_\infty = M. \end{cases}$$

To show the convergence to equilibrium for (5.1), we consider the entropy functional

$$\mathcal{E}(u,v) = \int_\Omega (u\log u - u + 1)dx + \int_\Gamma (v\log v - v + 1)dS$$

and its entropy-dissipation

$$\mathcal{D}(u,v) = d_u \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u}dx + d_u \int_\Gamma \frac{|\nabla_\Gamma v|^2}{v}dS + \int_\Gamma (u^\alpha - v^\beta)\log\frac{u^\alpha}{v^\beta}dS.$$

The aim is to prove an EED estimate of the form

$$\mathcal{D}(u,v) \geq \lambda(\mathcal{E}(u,v) - \mathcal{E}(u_\infty, v_\infty)), \tag{5.2}$$

for all (u,v) satisfying the mass conservation $\beta\int_\Omega u(x)dx + \alpha\int_\Gamma v(x)dS = M$.

The EED estimate (5.2) can be proved by applying the method proposed in Section 2 with few changes, e.g. the Poincaré inequality is replaced by the Trace inequality $\|\nabla f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq C_T\|f - \overline{f}\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)}$. The interested reader is referred to [FLT] for more details.

In fact, it's easy to verify that the results of [FLT] are also applicable in the following network

$$\alpha_1\mathcal{U}_1 + \ldots + \alpha_I\mathcal{U}_I \leftrightharpoons \beta_1\mathcal{V}_1 + \ldots + \beta_J\mathcal{V}_J$$

in the case that $\mathcal{U}_{i=1,\ldots,I}$ are volume-concentrations on Ω and $\mathcal{V}_{j=1,\ldots,J}$ are surface-concentrations on $\partial\Omega$.

5.2. **Open problems.** There are many open problems related to the results of this paper. Here, we list the two questions we find the most interesting:

1. How to choose the conservation laws in the general case?
   As mentioned in the introduction, the conservation laws $\mathbb{Q}\,\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathbf{M}$ depend on the choice of the matrix $\mathbb{Q}$, which has rows forming a basis of $\ker(W)$, where W is the Wegscheider matrix. The choice of $\mathbb{Q}$ is not unique and in fact, there are infinitely many matrices like $\mathbb{Q}$. The question is: can we have a procedure or a method to choose such a matrix $\mathbb{Q}$ for general systems, which is suitable for our method and allows to explicitly complete the proof of (1.24) and (1.25) in the general case?
2. How to get optimal convergence rate?
   We made it clear in this paper (see Remark 2.2) that although we obtain an explicit bound for the convergence rate, the convergence rate in this work is non-optimal. The question of optimal convergence rate using the entropy method is highly involved and left for future investigation.

Acknowledgements. The second author is supported by International Research Training Group IGDK 1754. This work has partially been supported by NAWI Graz.

References

[AMTU01] A. Arnold, P. Markowich, G. Toscani, A. Unterreiter, *On convex Sobolev inequalities and the rate of convergence to equilibrium for Fokker–Planck type equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **26** (2001) 43–100.

[BCD07] M. Bisi, F. Conforto, L. Desvillettes, *Quasi-steady-state approximation for reaction–diffusion equations*, Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.) **2** (2007) 823–850.

[BP10] D. Bothe, M. Pierre, *Quasi-steady-state approximation for a reaction-diffusion system with fast intermediate*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **368** (2010) 120–132.

[CDF08] J.A. Carrillo, L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, *Exponential decay towards equilibrium for the inhomogeneous Aizenman-Bak model*, Commun. Math. Phys., **278** (2008), 433–451.

[CDF08a] J.A. Carrillo, L. Desvillettes and K. Fellner, *Fast-Reaction Limit for the Inhomogeneous Aizenman-Bak Model,* Kinet. Relat. Models **1** (2008) 127–137.

[CDF14] J.A. Cañizo, L. Desvillettes and K. Fellner, *Improved duality estimates and applications to reaction-diffusion equations*, Comm. PDE, 39 (2014) pp. 1185–1204.

[CF06] G. Craciun, M. Feinberg, *Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks: II. The species-reaction graph*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **66** (2006) 1321–1338.
[CV03] J. Carrillo, J.L. Vazquez, *Fine asymptotics for fast diffusion equations,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations **28** (2003), 1023–1056.
[CDSS09] G. Craciun, A. Dickenstein, A. Shiu, and B. Sturmfels. *Toric dynamical systems,* J. Symb. Comput., **44** (2009), 1551–1565.
[Cra] G. Craciun, *Toric Differential Inclusions and a Proof of the Global Attractor Conjecture*, arXiv:1501.02860.
[PD02] M. Del Pino, J. Dolbeault, *Best constants for Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities and applications to nonlinear diffusions,* J. Math. Pures Appl. **81** (2002), 847–875.
[DF06] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, *Exponential decay toward equilibrium via entropy methods for reaction-diffusion equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **319** (2006) 157–176.
[DF08] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, *Entropy methods for reaction-diffusion equations: slowly growing a-priori bounds*, Revista Matematica Iberoamericana **24** (2008) 407–431.
[DFM08] M. Di Francesco, K. Fellner, P. Markowich, *The entropy dissipation method for inhomogeneous reaction–diffusion systems*, Proc. Royal Soc. A **464** (2008) 3272–3300.
[DF14] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, *Exponential Convergence to Equilibrium for a Nonlinear Reaction-Diffusion Systems Arising in Reversible Chemistry*, System Modelling and Optimization, IFIP AICT, **443** (2014) 96–104.
[DFT] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, B. Q. Tang, *Trend to equilibrium for reaction-diffusion systems arising from complex balanced chemical reaction networks*, Preprint 2016.
[DFPV07] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, M. Pierre, J. Vovelle, *About global existence of quadratic systems of reaction-diffusion*, J. Advanced Nonlinear Studies **7** (2007), 491–511.
[DV00] L. Desvillettes, C. Villani, *On the spatially homogeneous Landau equation for hard potentials. II. H-theorem and applications,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations **25**, no. 1-2 (2000), 261–298.
[DV01] L. Desvillettes, C. Villani, *On the trend to global equilibrium in spatially inhomogeneous entropy-dissipating systems: the linear Fokker-Planck equation,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **54**, **1** (2001), 1–42.
[DV05] L. Desvillettes, C. Villani, *On the trend to global equilibrium for spatially inhomogeneous kinetic systems: the Boltzmann equation,* Inventiones Mathematicae **159**, (2005) 245–316.
[Jan15] J. Eliaš, *Mathematical model of the role and temporal dynamics of protein p53 after drug-induced DNA damage*, PhD Thesis, Pierre and Marie Curie University, 2015.
[FL16] K. Fellner, E.-H. Laamri, *Exponential decay towards equilibrium and global classical solutions for nonlinear reaction-diffusion systems*, to appear in J. Evol. Equ. (2016).
[FLS16] K. Fellner, E. Latos and T. Suzuki, *Global classical solutions for mass-conserving, (super)-quadratic reaction-diffusion systems in three and higher space dimensions*, to appear in DCDS-B.
[FLT] K. Fellner, E. Latos and B. Q. Tang, *Well-posedness and exponential equilibration of a volume-surface reaction-diffusion system with nonlinear boundary coupling*, arXiv:1404.2809.
[FNS04] K. Fellner, L. Neumann, C. Schmeiser, *Convergence to global equilibrium for spatially inhomogeneous kinetic models of non-micro-reversible processes*, Monatsh. Math. **141** (2004), 289–299.
[FRT16] K. Fellner, S. Rosenberger, and B. Q. Tang. *A reaction-diffusion system modeling asymmetric stem-cell division: existence, uniqueness, numerical simulation and rigorous quasi-steady-state approximation.* to appear in Comm. Math. Sci. **147** (2016).
[Fei79] M. Feinberg, *Lectures on Chemical Reaction Networks*, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1979, https://crnt.osu.edu/LecturesOnReactionNetworks.
[Fis15] J. Fischer, *Global existence of renormalized solutions to entropy-dissipating reaction-diffusion systems*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **218** (2015) 553–587.
[FNR13] E. Friedmann, R. Neumann, and R. Rannacher, *Well-posedness of a linear spatio-temporal model of the JAK2/STAT5 signaling pathway.* Comm. Math. Anal. **15** (2013) 76–102.
[GZ10] I. Gentil, B. Zegarlinski, *Asymptotic behaviour of a general reversible chemical reaction-diffusion equation*, Kinet. Relat. Models **3** (2010), 427–444.
[GGH96] A. Glitzky, K. Gröger, R. Hünlich, *Free energy and dissipation rate for reaction-diffusion processes of electrically charged species,* Appl. Anal. **60** (1996), 201–217.
[GH97] A. Glitzky, R. Hünlich, *Energetic estimates and asymptotics for electro-reaction-diffusion systems,* Z. Angew. Math. Mech. **77** (1997), 823–832.
[HJ72] F.J.M. Horn and R. Jackson, *General mass action kinetics*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 47 (1972), pp. 81–116.
[KD01] Y.-I. Kwon, J. J. Derby, *Modeling the coupled effects of interfacial and bulk phenomena during solution crystal growth*, J. Cryst. Growth **230** (2001) 328–335.
[MHM15] A. Mielke, J. Haskovec, P. A. Markowich, *On uniform decay of the entropy for reaction-diffusion systems*, J. Dyn. Diff. Eqs. **27** (2015) 897–928.
[MS11] E. S. Medvedev, A. A. Stuchebrukhov, *Proton diffusion along biological membranes*, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **23** (2011) 234103.
[Mur02] James D. Murray, Mathematical Biology, Springer, 2002.
[NGCRSS07] I. L. Novak, F. Gao, Y.-S. Choi, D. Resasco, J. C. Schaff, B. M. Slepchenko, *Diffusion on a curved surface coupled to diffusion in the volume: application to cell biology*, J. Comput. Phys. **226** (2007) 1271–1290.
[Pie10] Pierre, M., *Global existence in reaction-diffusion systems with control of mass: a survey.* Milan J. Math. **78** (2010), 417–455.
[TV99] G. Toscani, C. Villani, *Sharp entropy dissipation bounds and explicit rate of trend to equilibrium for the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation,* Commun. Math. Phys. **203** (1999), 667–706.
[TV00] G. Toscani, C. Villani, *On the trend to equilibrium for some dissipative systems with slowly increasing a priori bounds,* J. Statist. Phys. **98** (2000), 1279–1309.
[Vil03] C. Villani, *Cercignani's conjecture is sometimes true and always almost true,* Commun. Math. Phys. **234** (2003), 455–490.

[Vol72] A.I. Volpert, Differential equations on graphs, Mat. Sb. **88** no.130 (1972) 578–588 (in Russian) Math. USSR-Sb. **17** (1972) 571–582 (in English).
[VVV94] A.I. Volpert, V.A. Volpert, VL.A. Volpert, Traveling Wave Solutions of Parabolic Systems, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994.
[Wil] D. Willett, *A linear generalization of Gronwall's inequality*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (1965) pp. 774–778.

Bao Quoc Tang
Institute of Mathematics and Scientific Computing, University of Graz, Heinrichstrasse 36, 8010 Graz, Austria
E-mail address: quoc.tang@uni-graz.at

Klemens Fellner
Institute of Mathematics and Scientific Computing, University of Graz, Heinrichstrasse 36, 8010 Graz, Austria
E-mail address: klemens.fellner@uni-graz.at